

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 965

HE 003 373

AUTHOR Berte, Neal R., Ed.
TITLE Innovations in Undergraduate Education: Selected
 Institutional Profiles and Thoughts About
 Experimentalism.
INSTITUTION Alabama Univ., Tuscaloosa. New College.; National
 Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 126p.; Report of a conference on Innovations in
 Undergraduate Education, The University of Alabama,
 Tuscaloosa, January, 1972
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; *Educational Improvement;
 *Educational Innovation; *Experimental Colleges;
 *Experimental Curriculum; Experimental Programs;
 *Higher Education

ABSTRACT

In January 1972, The University of Alabama held a 4-day invitational conference to bring together the leaders of those institutions that offer innovative and experimental programs. Specifically, the purposes of the conference were: (1) to share critical reports from each participant about each of their programs; (2) to make recommendations regarding those experimental efforts that appear to be successful and how they could be extended; (3) to encourage experimentation not yet underway; and (4) to compile, publish and distribute a report about the conference so that those not in attendance could benefit from this pooling of information and recommendations. The bulk of this publication consists of the institutional profiles developed by each of the 12 participants. The 3 appendices present the guidelines followed by the participants in writing the institutional reports, an evaluation of the conference, and a roster of the participants. (HS)

ED 067965

INNOVATIONS IN
UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION:
SELECTED
INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES
AND THOUGHTS ABOUT
EXPERIMENTALISM

Report of Conference in January, 1972

Co-Sponsored By

New College
The University of Alabama
and
The National Science Foundation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL POSITION OR POLICY.

146 0023373

Dr. Neal R. Berte
1

ED 067965

INNOVATIONS IN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION:

SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES AND THOUGHTS ABOUT EXPERIMENTALISM

Report of Conference in January, 1972

Co-Sponsored By
New College
The University of Alabama
and
The National Science Foundation

Dr. Neal R. Berte

Preface

Since the turn of the century, experimental colleges have flourished in this country. That the experimental college movement is alive and healthy today is fairly well accepted as is the fact that there is a need for greater understanding of what efforts are underway and how these could be extended in the future for the reform of higher education. A four-day conference was held in January, 1972, at the University of Alabama conference site with support from the National Science Foundation for the purpose of calling together leaders of innovative programs at various institutions from across the country.

Specifically, the purposes of this Invitational Conference included:

- To share critical reports from each participant about each of their programs;
- To make recommendations regarding those experimental efforts that appear to be successful and how they could be extended;
- To encourage experimentation not yet underway;
- To compile, publish and distribute a report about the conference so that those not in attendance could benefit from this pooling of information and recommendations.

Representatives from twelve institutions involved in experimental curricular programs were invited to participate in this program. Due to last minute circumstances, Dr. Joseph Shoben, Vice President of Evergreen State University, was unable to attend. Each representative who participated agreed to prepare a descriptive report about the experimental program he was representing and this report was circulated one month in advance of the time of the conference. The guidelines which were recommended for writing each institutional report are included as Appendix A and specify concern for six basic areas:

- (1) Primary educational objectives and underlying philosophy of the experimental program
- (2) Identification of student learning experiences which represent desired outcomes of the experimental program
- (3) Innovative instructional approaches as a part of the experimental program
- (4) Evaluation of student experiences in the total program
- (5) Development of faculty and evaluation of their contribution to the total program
- (6) Concern for external relations.

A deliberate effort was made to select representatives of diverse institutions engaged in experimental efforts which depart from traditional approaches to the undergraduate education experience. Institutions represented include both public and private, large and small, open admissions to minority admissions, honor's colleges to external degree programs for diverse clienteles. The bulk of this publication consists of the institutional profiles developed by each individual participant.

The concluding section represents an attempt to bring out some of the implications for change which may be of assistance particularly to those who are beginning innovative and experimental approaches.

Specific acknowledgement is given to the National Science Foundation for their interest and financial assistance in sponsoring the Invitational Conference, particularly that of Dr. Lafe Edmunds, Experimental Projects Coordinator for Education. The presence of Dr. Arthur Chickering, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Empire State College, and Dr. Harold Hodgkinson, Project Director for the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley, California, should be noted in terms of their invaluable contributions to the conference sessions in their role of consultant. Gratitude is also expressed to Mr. Chris Poythress, graduate student at the University of Alabama, for his thorough and excellent approach to reviewing conference proceedings and to Mrs. Sherri Moody, Secretary of the New College at the University of Alabama. Finally, the quality of participation by the institutional representatives should be acknowledged as the highlight of the conference in terms of honest and open sharing of strengths and weaknesses of the various programs in order for those present to learn from the experience of others.

Participants were asked to evaluate the conference experience in terms of the most valuable experiences, the least valuable experiences, and other general reactions; a brief evaluation report appears as Appendix B of this publication. A roster of all those present appears as Appendix C.

It is believed that the conference experience went a long way towards a critical evaluation of experimental efforts which are already underway and provided an opportunity for information sharing regarding these efforts. It is hoped that a logical outcome of the conference and this publication would be not only an increased awareness of what is going on but also some better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of various efforts which can be adapted to local conditions and built on in such a way that educationally sound innovation is encouraged.

Table of Contents

Preface

Ecology U. Is Alive and Healthy.....	1
Robert H. Maier, Vice-Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay	
New College.....	12
Neal R. Berte, Dean, The University of Alabama	
Florida Presbyterian College.....	34
John Jacobson, Dean	
Livingston College, Rutgers University.....	38
Ernest Lynton, Dean	
Hampshire College.....	41
Robert Birney, Vice President	
University of California, Santa Cruz.....	45
Lloyd J. Ring, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor	
The Purpose of Antioch.....	64
James Dixon, President	
University Without Walls.....	67
Samuel Baskin, President, Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities	
State University of New York, College at Old Westbury.....	73
John Maguire, President	
Bensalem: An Analysis.....	80
Kenneth D. Freeman, Dean, Fairhaven College, Western Washington State University	
Ottawa University	97
Peter H. Armacost, President	
Some Thoughts About Experimentalism.....	108
Neal R. Berte	
Appendix A—Guidelines—Institutional Reports.....	115
Appendix B—Evaluation of Conference.....	117
James Stone, Graduate Student, The University of Alabama	
Appendix C—Roster of Participants.....	119

Ecology U. Is Alive and Healthy

**Robert H. Maier, Vice-Chancellor
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay**

The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay has one of the most distinctive academic plans of any institution in the nation. The central theme or idea of the entire university is ecology or the emphasis on man in his environment, hence the name Ecology U. or Survival U. has been used by many who have visited the campus and examined the program.

The framework for the academic plan was developed in 1966-67 and intensive planning was implemented in 1967 and '68 to be ready to accept students in a baccalaureate degree-granting institution in the fall of 1969. To many of those involved in the academic planning, the intensity of effort was akin to producing "Instant University."

A slight amount of background information is necessary for understanding the manner and shape of the academic programs at UWGB. A northeastern Wisconsin campus of the University of Wisconsin was authorized by the 1965 legislature. After considerable consternation and debate the present site was selected in 1967. The Chancellor, Edward W. Weidner, and this writer were selected in 1966 and 1967 respectively to begin planning a new institution of higher education. The new UWGB absorbed four existing two-year campuses of the UW Center System, namely, Green Bay, Marinette, Manitowoc, and Menasha (Fox Valley) and developed its plan utilizing the four campuses with Green Bay as the "home campus." In 1967, the Wisconsin Coordinating Council for Higher Education (now extinct) decided that the Green Bay Campus would be the only campus having a four-year baccalaureate program and that the remaining three campuses of UWGB would offer only freshman and sophomore courses, thereby serving mainly a transfer function to UWGB or any other baccalaureate degree-granting institution. Thus, academic planning for the full year program was concentrated on the Green Bay Campus; but as much lower division level work as possible, coinciding with the academic program at Green Bay was made available to the three two-year campuses of UWGB. The recently enacted merger bill in Wisconsin merging the Wisconsin State University campuses into a new University of Wisconsin System calls for the return of all two-year campuses into the UW Center System. As soon as an effective date of transfer to the Center System is decided, UWGB will be a one campus institution located in Green Bay.

The early planners of UWGB foresaw the wisdom of wide participation in the development of the academic program. In fact, this approach is very much in evidence today in the "communiversity" concept which recognizes that little or no interface exists between the campus and the university's community. Following the preparation of a skeletal academic plan which called for the development of four theme colleges and a School of Professional Studies, planning seminars of approximately a week's duration were established in the summer of 1967 for each of the theme colleges and the School of Professional Studies. These planning seminars consisted of the newly employed administrative staff of UWGB plus faculty and students from the four two-year campuses absorbed by UWGB. However, most importantly, other educators from within and outside the state were asked to join in the planning effort. In addition, community people from northeastern Wisconsin were asked to contribute ideas which yielded a grass-roots input to the planning seminars. Over 350 people were involved in the preparation of the academic plan for UWGB which was approved by the Wisconsin Coordinating Council for Higher Education and the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents in the spring of 1968! One of the strengths of this university proved to be the inclusion of the community and the response of the community to that invitation to share progress and problems.

The skeletal framework of the academic plan focused on the interdisciplinary approach to educating students in the use of problem-oriented foci. The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay was created to provide a viable alternative within higher education by plowing new ground! While the UWGB plan might not satisfy other institutions of higher education and certainly could not be implemented "across the board" for a large established institution, it does provide a new and flexible approach geared to meet the needs and demands of the last quarter of this century and the turn of the next century. The university provides an innovative and stimulating environment for educating the leaders and inhabitants of tomorrow who, hopefully, will be better equipped to handle the complexity of problems that have been produced by an extremely advanced interaction of science and technology. The disciplines through their excellence have contributed to man's problems and successes, but these same disciplines acting alone are not able to cope and solve the deep and penetrating issues facing mankind today and tomorrow. New mechanisms and approaches must be found and UWGB offers some of these new alternatives.

Consequently, the academic plan at UWGB is organized not through discipline departments but around concentrations which are interdisciplinary orientations to particular environmental problems. At present there are 13 concentrations:

- 1: Ecosystems Analysis—the dynamics of the flows and

transactions of energy and material in the ecosystem and the processes governing the regulation of the numbers of organisms must be understood both qualitatively and quantitatively for man to develop a wise strategy for the use and management of natural resources.

2. **Environmental Control**—environmental pollution and the demands on natural resources threaten the biosphere. Man must develop an appropriate strategy for the control, use, and management of biological and physical resources.
3. **Analysis-Synthesis**—provides a concentration of modern man's obligation to be engaged with, and responsible for, his total environment: the environment of thought, values, society, technology, and nature. It reintegrates the long separated humanistic and non-humanistic dimensions of thought and action.
4. **Communication-Action**—this concentration defines the environmental crises as one in communication: communication in society made ineffective by many kinds of interference or cultural static, and individual expression damaged by various kinds of physical, psychological, and intellectual aphasia.
5. **Growth and Development**—to optimize the development of the individual, this concentration seeks to promote the understanding of the effect of the physical and social interaction involving man and his environment.
6. **Human Adaptability**—is concerned with programs that assist students to understand the adaptability and variability of the individual human being which arises in response to environmental stress or pressure.
7. **Modernization Processes**—modernization is found to resolve as well as create crises such as social inequality, alienation, and protest movements. The program emphasis is directed toward the theoretical and practical aspects of understanding and reacting to the consequences and problems of modernization. Specifically, this concentration examines the phenomenon of social change and periods of social change.
8. **Nutritional Sciences**—the programs of this concentration are oriented toward the reality that man, if he is to cope with his environment, must understand that food quantity and quality, and aesthetic value are necessary for his existence. Emphasis is placed on community and industrial nutrition.
9. **Population Dynamics**—the major goal of this concentration is to prepare students who can work toward the understanding and solving of the problems atten-

dant with a rapidly expanding population. Teamwork by individuals trained in biology and the social and behavioral sciences is essential.

10. **Regional Analysis**—the focus on the study of the community sciences with respect to the spatial relationship between man and his environment is the keystone of this concentration. The effective application of individual capacities and use of material resources depends upon man's understanding of their regional distribution and interactions.
11. **Urban Analysis**—is the study of the characteristics of urban areas and the processes, physical and social, by which cities emerge, persist, and change as a function of time.
12. **Managerial Systems**—this is a professional concentration designed for the student who wishes to focus upon the fields of business or public administration. The student electing this professional concentration will take course work in one or more of the above concentrations to provide further for the interaction of business and public administration with environmental concerns.
13. **"Wild Card Concentration"**—while the above mentioned concentrations provide a wide variety of environmental program opportunities, a student can elect, with the assistance of a faculty advisor(s), to develop a personal program of study which will satisfy the requirements for graduation and permit the student to develop a concentration geared to his personal needs and interests.

The central cohesiveness of the academic plan is provided by the liberal education seminar (LES), a four-year program through which every student receives the opportunity to relate the classic concepts of values to a present day ecological problem. The freshman year of LES is concerned with the concepts of values, ecology, and environment. The sophomore year contains a focus on environmental problems of the Great Lakes Region, both in the classroom and by means of an off-campus study project. This project is expanded in the junior year to include some other region in the United States or abroad permitting the student by way of contrast to examine his own culture through the examination of another culture. The student during the senior year integrates what he has learned during the three previous years and explores the possible consequences of present day situations to future generations.

In addition to the LES being required for graduation, there are distribution and tool subject courses which the student must complete. A recent action has made the individual concentrations responsible for what tool subjects, i.e., data processing, statistics, arts, foreign languages, etc. are to be required

by the students selecting that particular concentration as a major.

A major at UWGB consists of 30 to 36 credits of work completed at the junior-senior level and organized around an environmental theme (concentration). The student may choose to emphasize professional application of the major by selecting a collateral to be applied across the concentration selected for major work. Professional collateral courses are offered in teacher certification, environmental administration, mass communications, leisure sciences, and social services. An exciting program in environmental education is developing rapidly. Further details on selecting a major with or without an accompanying option and/or collateral are described in the UWGB catalog.

The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provides many opportunities for those who have not pursued higher education and for those who have had to interrupt their education to work, raise a family, or fulfill a military obligation. The office of adult education is dedicated to providing information to the community on what courses of study, both credit and non-credit, are available. The university feels that one of its major challenges in the years ahead will be the realization of a burgeoning continuing education program based on the assumption that education is a lifelong process. With increasing leisure time becoming available, more men and women will want to develop further their intellectual and cultural skills and talents for entertainment and productive responses to the environmental stimuli. This institutional goal has been gratified by a keen response from this sector of the Green Bay community and its rural-urban environs.

An important aspect of UWGB is the development of the office of educational development. This office has several responsibilities with one of the most significant charges in the area of assisting in program evaluation. Evaluation of new program directions and techniques is equal in importance to the innovation developed and implemented! This office also assists faculty and students in developing course evaluation. For example, experimental questionnaires have been used to help design a questionnaire suitable for UWGB. Three different forms were distributed to selected classes. One form was the traditional type regarding the instructor's behavior; a second focused on the student's own estimate of his self-development as affected by the course; and the third form was used to study the structure of the student's attitude and degree of ego involvement in the course. Response to these forms indicated seven basic dimensions of student reaction to courses:

1. **Overall Evaluation** of the course, with questions such as "considering everything, how would you rate this course?"
2. **Student-teacher Interaction**, with questions such as "Is

- the instructor sensitive to students feelings and problems?"
- 3. **Difficulty Level** of the course, with questions such as "Do students have to exert themselves intellectually to meet course requirements?"
 - 4. **Organization**, with questions such as "Were the course objectives clear?"
 - 5. **General Cognitive Development** of the student, with items such as "I developed my ability to marshal or identify main points or central issues."
 - 6. **Field - Specific Development** of the student, with items such as "can understand relatively advanced presentations on the subject."
 - 7. **Relevance** of the material for the student, with items as "I became aware of implications of the subject matter in my own life."

Identification of factors 5-7 is a promising feature of the analyses conducted at UWGB. The student's development is the major focus of attention and curiously is not covered by course evaluation questionnaires in use at most other institutions. The administration encourages the evaluation of all programs, techniques, and personnel. Since most other institutions cannot serve as models in these areas, progress has been slow but revealing. The work in evaluation at UWGB in the years ahead should prove to be as productive and meaningful as the development of the original academic plan.

Another important resource has been the office of instructional services which includes computing services, curator of art, library, and educational communications. For example, activities in educational communications presently include microwave transmission of seven courses to the Marinette Campus of UWGB and are augmented by an exchange of questions and answers through studio and classroom intercampus audio facilities. Videotape distribution, cassette duplication, and closed circuit distribution combine with television, audio, photo-film, and graphics to create a distinctive instructional service program answering the needs for innovation in instructional technology in the era of ecology.

Students have been enrolling in increasing numbers at UWGB. Realizing that the fall of 1969 was the first year UWGB was open as a four-year baccalaureate degree-granting institution, there has been a 34 percent increase in students from 1969 to 1971 for all four campuses. However, the Green Bay Campus, during the same period of time experienced a 128 percent increase in enrollment! Since it was not possible to offer innovative junior and senior courses at the three two-year campuses of UWGB (because of the decision of the Coordinating Council mentioned earlier) the enrollments at the two-year campuses have been in a declining posture. Quite the opposite is true for the Green Bay Campus with enroll-

ments expected to increase into the 1980's. Present enrollment for all four campuses is 4,579; while present enrollment on the Green Bay Campus is 3,531 (Table 1). Approximately five percent of the Green Bay Campus enrollment are non-resident students from 32 states and 10 foreign countries. The Green Bay Campus is expected to enroll approximately 4,000 students next year.

The accelerated rate of increase in students has placed a definite strain on the budget which is accentuated by the biennial budget process. A new rapidly developing institution would be aided by an annual budget process not only for operational funds but also for the building budget. Innovation costs money and this concept is difficult to "sell" to legislators and others who feel comfortable in comparing costs of education between an institution three years old and those which have been in existence for more than 20 or 30 years. At the outset of developing new institutions and new programs, equity cannot be an all encompassing facet of budget justification. However, on the other hand, institutions must become more accountable in their dealings with their publics and strive to cut costs while maintaining and, for new programs, increasing the quality of undergraduate education. This institution has developed a system of program budgeting which lends itself well to this type of academic program.

Innovation is essential if higher education is going to continue to discharge its responsibility to learning in the future. Unfortunately, institutions of today who wished to be classified as progressive have succumbed to using "innovation" to embrace any and all institutional changes. Much of what is seen represents the adoption of fads and relatively minor changes or modifications in existing procedures and structure. For example, an interdisciplinary program should not be represented by a "cafeteria" approach where the student picks a little here and a little there but rather it should represent an environment where learning is integrated into a unified body of knowledge and presentation supported by faculty, students, and in some cases the community working together to accomplish the goals of the program. It has been said that true innovation develops when ideas and practices are organized in new and creative ways for the promotion of learning and thereby produce new or alter distinctly the basic philosophy mission of the unit and/or the institution.

This institution attempts to keep the fires of innovation alive which is sometimes difficult to accomplish. One of the major problems confronted in developing and implementing this institution is the extreme amount of work and energy required. Administrators try to secure the resources to continue to implement the plan and give direction and encouragement for the fulfillment of the academic plan while faculty are hard at work developing new courses, producing video tapes, struggling with committees and attempting to advance their

scholarly recognition within their respective professional societies. The talents and abilities of people to interact in a positive manner to produce a satisfactory outcome (innovation) is never more tested and strained than in developing new institutions or new programs. It takes a special "breed of cat" to pull this off. At the same time the students are taking our courses, helping plan new programs, and are exposed to frustrations which are difficult for them (and others) to understand.

This university operates on a 4-1-4 calendar with the month of January set aside for special studies focused on relevance, intensive learning, and practical application. January course offerings include practical, special innovative courses, other culture and off-campus experiences, developmental and extra elementary level work to strengthen individual student proficiencies. The 4-1-4 program potentially offers the student the opportunity to graduate within three years.

The success of innovation in this or any other institution is dependent upon the faculty, the synchronization of individual goals with the goals of the concentration, the other units and the institution. One of the primary challenges is to interpret the institutional mission in terms which allow the professional and non-professional components to identify their individual goals and thereby look forward to personal advancement. The challenge to the administration is to make the institution and its organizational components more effective in progressing toward goal achievement. However, it must be remembered that an institution does not set goals; only people do.

People are either task- or goal-oriented. The task-oriented person is mainly interested in performing a job whereas the goal-oriented person is dedicated to achieving a predetermined level of success. Charles Hughes has given us excellent comparisons of the two types of orientation as shown in Table 2. In general, an internal innovation climate in higher education is composed of governing boards, administration, faculty, staff, and yes, even students who are goal-oriented.

One of the major tasks facing higher education is to develop sound, reasonable methods of evaluating personnel performance appraisal. At UWGB, faculty who are considered for promotion and merit raises are evaluated on the basis of four criteria (examples are given for each category):

1. Teaching effectiveness
 - a. Student evaluation
 - b. Peer evaluation
2. Research
 - a. Problem-oriented
 - b. Publications in non-referred materials as well as referred journals
3. Communiiversity projects
 - a. Significant interaction with the community to accomplish an institutional goal

- b. Little emphasis is placed on the mere membership on community committees—the key is the accomplishment of university-community projects
- 4. Institutional development
 - a. Development of innovational techniques in instruction and administration
 - b. Examples of course syllabi showing the innovational thrust
 - c. Production of audio-visual materials which enhance the academic program

In-service faculty development is provided by the Vice Chancellor's office in providing money to the Deans for faculty members to develop further their interdisciplinary courses and/or projects. This is "seed money" for faculty to continue their professional advancement while at the same time contributing to accomplishing the mission of the institution. The office of instructional services provides a staff for those faculty members who are interested in developing audio-visual courses and materials, particularly the production of video-tape or live microwave transmissions to other campuses.

Thus far our graduates have been sought by industry, government, and education. This action-oriented academic plan produces a student who is better able to cope with the complexities of the broad spectrum of problems we face today and the extreme complexity of tomorrow's environmental problems. There is little or no risk for students to undertake this program, in fact, in the future there will be a more distinct advantage for students completing a degree at UWGB.

There are no transferability problems of our undergraduates who might wish to transfer to another campus. For example, we do not offer engineering, law, and medicine, however, much of the "major" in certain cases can be considered as pre-professional education in these areas. No difficulty has been encountered by our students in entering graduate school, although the discipline rigidity of many graduate programs in other institutions will not be especially appealing to our students. Some institutions are developing truly interdisciplinary graduate programs and it is to these programs that our students would be attracted.

We have exercised very rigorous selection procedures in employing faculty and administrators. The key to this type of program is to attract, employ, and hold that special "breed of cat" referred to earlier. Faculty coming to UWGB do take a risk compared to going to a highly discipline-oriented department type institution since most of the professional organizations have a reward system built in and out of the traditional disciplines. Our challenge is to identify the reward structure in evidence at UWGB and to contribute interdisciplinary papers and presentations at discipline-oriented professional meetings.

An institution like UWGB has to sell its program. The institution cannot expect its students and publics to come to them, but we carry the story to those who can benefit and help. This consumes a great deal of time and energy of administration, faculty, staff, and students but is a major responsibility of the administration. This institution continues to seek those people and organizations who are receptive to the approach being used at UWGB. Outside speakers and visitors are commonplace on the campus.

This report has purposely omitted much of the detail of the academic plan depending upon the catalog and other forms of communication to satisfy specific, detailed questions.

The administration of a university cannot coerce a colleague (including students) into creativity and productivity, but it can provide an environment which yields challenging and relevant opportunities to satisfy individual motivational and achievement needs. We, as you are, are mindful of the honor and responsibilities of our positions and our institutions since we have been entrusted with the nurture of one of mankind's most precious resources—the human mind.

Table I. TOTAL ENROLLMENT OF UWGB by CLASS, SEX, AND CAMPUS

Semester 1, 1971-72

	Green Bay	Menasha	Manitowoc	Marinette	Total
Freshmen					
M	637	153	90	122	1002
F	511	74	58	72	715
Total	1148	227	148	194	1717
Sophomores					
M	547	80	60	55	742
F	378	50	30	34	492
Total	925	130	90	89	1234
Juniors					
M	432	0	0	0	432
F	253	0	0	0	253
Total	685	0	0	0	685
Seniors					
M	303	0	0	0	303
F	172	0	0	0	172
Total	475	0	0	0	475
Specials					
M	163	36	14	38	251
F	135	45	10	27	217
Total	298	81	24	65	468
Grand Total					
M	2082	269	164	215	2730
F	1449	169	98	133	1849
Total	3531	438	262	348	4579

**Table 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF GOAL-ORIENTATION
IN COMPARISON TO TASK-ORIENTATION***

Goal-Oriented Individual	Task-Oriented Individual
1. Seeks feedback and knowledge of results. Wants evaluation of own performance. Wants concrete feedback.	1. Avoids feedbacks and evaluation. Seeks approval rather than performance evaluation.
2. Considers money a standard of achievement rather than an incentive.	2. Job performance is directly influenced by money incentives.
3. Seeks personal responsibility for work if goal achievement is possible.	3. Avoids personal responsibility regardless of opportunities for success.
4. Performs best on jobs that can be improved. Prefers creativity.	4. Prefers routine jobs. Obtain little satisfaction from creativity.
5. Seeks goals with moderate risks.	5. Seeks goals with either very low or very high risks.
6. Obtains achievement satisfaction from solving difficult problems.	6. Obtains satisfaction from routine task accomplishment.
7. Has high drive and physical energy directed towards goals.	7. Energies are not goal-oriented.
8. Initiates actions. Perceives suggestions as interference.	8. Is a follower. Receptive to suggestions.
9. Adjusts level of aspiration to realities of success and failure.	9. Maintains high or low level of aspiration regardless of success or failure.

*Hughes, Charles L., "Goal Setting: Key to Individual and Organizations Effectiveness." American Management Association, New York, 1965.

New College

**Neal R. Berte, Dean
The University of Alabama**

I. Purpose

The New College at The University of Alabama represents a departure from the traditional approach to the undergraduate educational experience at the University and from most institutions nationally.

There are two purposes for the New College: (1) to create an opportunity for a highly individualized approach to undergraduate education which will draw freely from the extensive and diverse scholarship of the entire University faculty, and (2) to serve the University as an experimental unit with the expectation that program concepts, examination and measurement methods, teaching modes, use of time, facilities and personnel, and the like, will provide an experimental base for modifications to undergraduate education.

As related to the first purpose of the New College, the individualized curricular approach, there are a number of features of this educational experience which should be mentioned:

- Admission of the highly motivated and not just the intellectually elite
- A concept of advising that deals with the total development of the individual
- The use of the educational contract for planning purposes
- The problem-focused approach to general education through interdisciplinary seminars
- The recommended off-campus learning experience for credit
- The use of depth study programs involving independent study opportunities
- Individualized graduation requirements and evaluation procedures.

The New College is an "administrative college" more than a "substantive" one such as Commerce and Business Administration, since roughly two-thirds to three-fourths of the student's work is done outside of the New College. Through the New College, students are enrolled in courses from across the University representing any of the various

colleges in such a way that course experiences are packaged to meet students' individual needs. A representative from their major area of interest sits on their Contract-Advising Committee, and there are students who are taking course work from all of the various divisions of the University with the exception of Engineering. In this way, students are able to package educational experiences from the literally 3,000 course offerings available at The University of Alabama. By individualizing the educational program through the New College, the only additional courses offered are a set of interdisciplinary problem-focused seminars and the opportunity for independent study. In this way there is no need to completely duplicate faculty and resources already available at the institution. Students receive either a Bachelor of Arts or a Bachelor of Science degree depending upon the area in which they do their depth study.

The basic assumptions which underlie the above objectives include the following:

- That each individual is unique with different needs
- That an educational program should be developed which reflects the interests and capabilities of each student
- That opportunities should be provided for an individual to be able to learn to think and to deal with principles and concepts rather than simply to memorize data
- That students are capable of accepting much of the responsibility for their own learning when given the opportunity to do so
- That significant learning occurs outside of class as well as within
- That problem-focused, general education experiences of an interdisciplinary nature which demonstrate the integration of knowledge are highly desirable in our modern day world.

The student is offered studies in the main disciplinary areas within the humanities and the natural and social sciences through seminars which will help him pursue the relationships and interdependencies between these and other bodies of knowledge. All the program features—course work, advising, off-campus experiences—are planned around the theme of a practical integration of knowledge. The goal is to give each student depth of understanding and the ability to make decisions on the basis of informed and thoughtful judgment.

The general context for achieving the goals of the New College is an innovative approach to undergraduate learning.

It is important to see the above statement of purpose

and basic philosophy in the context of the historical development of the New College idea. For almost a two-year period prior to June 30, 1970, a committee of students, faculty members and members of the administration at The University of Alabama worked to come up with what might be a viable new educational approach. The members of the committee did considerable reading about new forms of learning and visited a number of institutions with innovative programs. The Dean of the New College served as a consultant to this committee as it began to conclude its work in the spring of 1970 since he had the benefit of major involvement with curriculum development at Ottawa University and had visited a number of innovative colleges as part of a Title III Grant from the Kansas City Regional Council of Higher Education.

In a June 30, 1970, final report, the committee called for a new degree-granting division at the University with the following characteristics:

"Admission based upon demonstrated motivation and intellectual independence with a commitment to a cross-section of students regarding abilities, age, sex, and a professional or vocational interest;

An individualized program of education utilizing the contract model;

Unifying study seminars of an interdisciplinary nature dealing with the great and urgent problems of the human condition;

An out-of-class learning experience for academic credit recommended for every student;

An opportunity for traditional or non-traditional specializations."

From the beginning, the commitment from key administrators, particularly from President David Mathews and from Vice-President for Academic Affairs at that time, Raymond F. McLain, was evident. In a June 7, 1971, article in the "Chronicle of Higher Education," Dr. Mathews is quoted as seeing the New College as a "goad and a catalyst for change" in the rest of the institution. The article goes on to say: "The University's President, David Mathews, says that he is committed to reforming undergraduate education, and that the New College seems to be the best way to effect reforms."

During the 1970-71 academic year, twenty students were enrolled in the New College as a pilot project group. For the fall semester of the 1971-72 academic year, 84 students are enrolled. The New College Committee Report of June 30, 1970, calls for a maximum enrollment of 450

students to be achieved during a 4-5 year period. From the response throughout the state and region, it appears that there will be no difficulty in reaching this figure in the next few years.

The Sidney A. Mitchell Memorial Fund was established "particularly for the inauguration of the 'New College' program for the students at Tuscaloosa." During the last two years this fund has been added to by the Sidney A. Mitchell family and other sources of money from various grants and University allotments have supplemented the New College budget.

II. The Program

A. Admissions

Since the New College is not an honors college, the program is available to students representing a wide range of academic backgrounds and levels of intellectual achievement, provided they manifest a significant level of motivation and intellectual independence. The selection procedures ensure the enrollment of a representative cross section of students with regard to such factors as ability, age, sex, race and professional or vocational interests.

The following factors are taken into consideration when making a decision for admission:

- The applicant's self-statement as to why he is interested in the New College and his educational goals, including any original work by the student;
- Letters of recommendation (3) from the student's peers and one adult pertaining to the applicant's potential, motivation, strengths and weaknesses, past performance, and personality;
- An interview with students, faculty and staff of the New College for the purpose of exploring the student's academic objectives and the degree to which the New College can serve him well;
- Consideration of past learning involvements either from high school or other educational experience; and
- Consideration of the ACT score.

The results of all of these efforts to gain information about the applicant are reviewed for a final decision by the Admissions Committee, which is composed of students, faculty and staff of the New College.

There are some students in the New College who would not have been admissible to other colleges of the University. Although they appeared to be highly motivated, they had not done well in traditional learning environments. One such Black student had his art

work selected as one of three students from the State of Alabama for display in the Kennedy Center for Performing Arts. Another student, the first Black sheriff since reconstruction days in Greene County, Alabama, which is the third-poorest county in the nation, attends the New College on a part-time basis. Still another student entered the New College after only three years in high school and another had published front page news articles in his hometown newspaper but had not achieved well previously by traditional standards. Honors college types of students from high school are also included in the New College as well as others who performed in an average way although they seem to have the motivation for learning which the Admissions Committee feels is important. The input from housewives returning to college has also added to the seminars.

B. Contract-Advising Committee

The New College provides individualization of instruction by contractual arrangement with each student. The student, with faculty, community and/or student advisors, plans his program of studies in the context of a Contract-Advising Committee. Usually no more than four individuals serve on this Committee and the only criterion for service is that a particular individual has something definite to contribute to the educational planning for that particular student. The student's individual needs, desires, capacities, motivations, familial and social influences, as well as his academic performance are taken into consideration by the Contract-Advising Committee. Concern is for the student's total development as a person. It is possible to modify or change the contract by request of the student to his Contract-Advising Committee for legitimate educational reasons as decided by the members of the Committee.

C. Interdisciplinary Problem-Focused Seminars Represent the Approach to General Education

Pursuant to the educational objectives of the New College, interdisciplinary seminars are offered in the social sciences, the humanities, and the physical and biological sciences. These seminars are focused on contemporary problems so as to allow the student to move from knowing to doing, from self-improvement to community betterment. Usually one seminar is taken each semester during the time that a student is enrolled in the New College. If the student enters as a transfer student, equivalent course experiences are substituted for the initial interdisciplinary seminars. During the senior year, an opportunity for a multi-

disciplinary seminar experience for each student will be available as a way to synthesize the earlier general education experiences.

Students enrolled in the interdisciplinary seminar which was offered during the spring semester of the 1971-72 academic year in the humanities dealing with the problem of communications, rated this experience as being extremely valuable at both the mid-term and final evaluation sessions. One faculty member provided the continuity for this seminar, but persons from on and off campus were brought in to deal with various topics in the course including philosophy, language, painting, sculpture, architecture, music, dance, theatre and film as means of communication. Currently students are dealing with such topics as "Man's Search for Values" in the humanities experience, a seminar on "Man, Behavior and Society" in the social science area, and studying the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project in the physical sciences seminar.

These seminars are required of all students and run throughout the student's time at the University, providing some 25 to 30 percent of his on-campus education. This affords a common intellectual experience to foster a sense of community in the New College.

These interdisciplinary, problem-focused seminars are designed to achieve three objectives. First, they are expected to provide the student with an opportunity to gain an understanding of the fundamentals of the main disciplinary areas within the humanities, social sciences, and sciences. Second, they are expected to assist the student in gaining an understanding of the relationships and interdependencies between these and other bodies of knowledge, including those of a vocational nature. Third, the seminars are directly concerned with the great and urgent problems of the human condition, and are designed both to help the student understand these problems and to be effective in responsible relationship to them.

D. Depth Study Program

The depth study program of the New College replaces the departmental "major." The "traditional" depth study program may be quite similar to the "major" but the arrangement of courses, allowed by the contract and the crossing of heretofore impregnable divisional boundaries, might differ considerably. Even greater variability is allowed the student whose needs warrant a "non-traditional" depth study program. The latter provides for a program of studies even more interdivisional in nature. Students enrolled in the New College vary in their depth study programs—from the more usual approaches in such areas as ele-

mentary education, accounting, or interior design to preparation for higher education administration, pre-law or social work.

E. Independent Study.

Independent study options are available in conjunction with either approach to depth study as an additional means by which a student may extend the study of his particular interest. Prior to involvement in independent study, the student must enter into an agreement with a supervising faculty member in such a way that he sets forth his plan for the proposed independent study. The student must prepare a clear, concise statement including the course area, topic, or problem he intends to study; his reasons for doing the particular study; his tentative plans for background reading, bibliography, and outline; his plans to initiate the study; and the anticipated outcomes of the study. Evaluative criteria are established by the student and his instructor prior to the student's receiving a class card for independent study.

F. Off-Campus Experiences

Off-campus learning experiences, usually of one semester's duration, are encouraged for all students in the New College. In the words of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, "Much more of education takes place before college, outside of college, and after college than ever before."¹ Thus some of the general purposes for having an off-campus learning experience include the following:

- 1) Through off-campus learning, the student will be accorded a variety of learning conditions, and this could be valuable in sustaining his motivation and enthusiasm toward reaching his particular educational goals.
- 2) The off-campus experience may play an important role in the value development of each student. Once away from the college campus, the student may be better able to question the ideas to which he has been exposed.
- 3) Certain types of off-campus learning experiences may encourage each student to gain an appreciation not only of his own culture, but also of other cultures.
- 4) Each student may gain a more liberal education as the off-campus learning experience will tend to be highly interdisciplinary, thus bringing to bear areas which a student might not normally think pertinent to his education.
- 5) Through off-campus learning the student may be provided the opportunity to earn money at

the same time he is gaining practical experience.

- 6) For the large number of students who are "other-people oriented," the off-campus experience may provide an opportunity to integrate their social concerns with the undergraduate curriculum.

Generally, the off-campus learning experiences are representative of one of four broad categories: (1) Cross-cultural (the student may spend a semester in a foreign country); (2) Sub-cultural (the student may be primarily involved with a cultural group other than his own in this country); (3) Formal employment (the student may work to test his vocational interests); and (4) Independent study (the student may elect to work on a project away from campus primarily on his own). Academic grades and credit are given for specific activities and skills demonstrated.

G. Electives

The electives program is designed to assist the student in broadening his interests beyond those served by the interdisciplinary seminars and his depth study program. In the first few years at the University, the chosen elective courses may offer the student an opportunity to pursue interests which may become depth study areas in the future. The Contract-Advising Committee becomes the context within which plans for elective course experiences are developed.

H. Evaluation

The student, as a member of his Contract-Advising Committee, is involved in the evaluation of his own performance. The Committee provides the student with a periodic, specific assessment of his progress towards the previously mutually agreed upon goals. Since all areas of work are reviewed, evaluation for a particular student might involve traditional grading, pass/fail or pass/no credit options, advanced placement examinations for degree credit, proficiency examinations, and comprehensive evaluation by instructors in those activities peculiar to the New College.

I. Graduation

In order to graduate from the New College, a student must:

- 1) Take no more than 24 hours of work on the pass/fail or pass/no credit system without approval of his Contract-Advising Committee (the student is encouraged to take the letter grade option for depth study courses in light of recent

- research about graduate school admission preferences);
- 2) Have an overall grade average of 1.0 (C ($A=3.0$) for all academic work; and
 - 3) Satisfactorily complete (a) the interdisciplinary general education program or equivalent, (b) a depth study program of either a traditional or a non-traditional nature, (c) elected distribution courses, and (d) an off-campus learning experience (highly recommended).

Normally, the student will be required to satisfactorily complete 128 semester hours of academic credit. This number may be reduced in individual cases as recommended by the Contract-Advising Committee and approved by the New College Review Committee, or as a result of advanced placement or other proficiency examinations.

III. Evaluation

An unusual paradox of the current concern for reform in higher education is the scarcity of studies of innovation and change. As Meyhew (1971) has said,

"Because of student pleas for more relevant education, and because of rather persuasive criticism of the process of education, one would expect a rather rich literature dealing with innovation and experimentation, and it is true that there are descriptions of a number of attempted changes. However, the volume and particularly the EVALUATIVE CONTENT (emphasis added) of these materials is less than could be hoped for. Innovations are apt to be merely described rather than discussed or questioned."²

If this represents an accurate reading of the literature, then the need for a well-developed evaluation program becomes even more meaningful, not only for the New College, but for other innovative programs as well.

In the book *Institutions in Transition* (1971), Hodgkinson, after reviewing the results of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education's Report for 1970, concludes that,

.... a series of federally financed "model colleges" is needed, somewhat akin to the Model Cities program, to try out promising innovation in a variety of institutional settings, with a sophisticated research-and-evaluation component designed into each model college. This is the way to lick the current passivity of institutional responses to new needs—the research and evaluation must be conceived from the ground up as an essential program function.³

One of the most complete reviews of experimental colleges and the problems of research and evaluation is the ERIC Clearinghouse of Higher Education Report entitled *The Experimental Subcollege (1971)*. The report indicates that the newly developing subcollege programs attempt to give the student a more personalized environment and to prepare them for the future in new and meaningful ways. These programs are also designed to analyze some of the effects of a "Numbered Society" (student number, social security number, etc.) while hopefully avoiding some of the dehumanizing aspects of a technological society. Consequently, the new programs have a number of common characteristics:

- 1) They are frequently small relative to other colleges;
- 2) They offer alternative curricula, many with a liberal arts emphasis;
- 3) Their educational methods are flexible: independent study; student-formed seminars; community governments; new methods of evaluation; and contract models for assessing student's learning; and
- 4) They utilize central administrative facilities, usually those of the university.

The research program for the New College is designed to meet the needs for research spelled out by the ERIC report. The following description represents current practice and future plans regarding New College evaluation efforts.

A. Standard Testing: Personal and Academic Growth

All students take a standard test battery composed of basic tests administered to all incoming students at the University and a special test battery developed in the New College. This initial testing serves as the baseline against which future testing will be compared so that standardized test data can be used to relate New College student development and changes in the general population. The instruments will be readministered once a year. This will keep the between-test period small enough to allow evaluation of what activities might be contributing to the measured changes. The battery includes measures of academic readiness and change, vocational interest, personality and value changes as well as basic demographic data.

Standardized measures. The standardized measures consist of the basic University program for all new students—School and College Abilities Test, American College Test (initial testing only), and Chemistry Aptitude Test (optional)—as well as the additional New

College battery—The Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes, The Omnibus Personality Inventory, The Allport-Vernon-Lindsey-Study of Values, and The Revised Strong Vocational Interest Inventory. Demographic data will be obtained through questionnaires modified from the ACE and Antioch Student Profile questionnaire.

Administration. The University instruments are administered to all students when they arrive for Freshman Counseling. The New College battery will be administered after the student has been accepted into the program. All tests will be readministered near the end of the spring semester each year. Completion of a four-year program should produce five test results so that the process of change, as well as terminal changes, may be measured.

Follow-Up. Basic information about the location of each student will be kept for three years after graduation and each graduate will be asked to retake the test battery at the end of the three years and perhaps additional times. This will provide some information about the impact of the New College program and will indicate what changes occur when one is no longer actively involved in the program. A master card file will be kept on the student including the addresses where they can be reached after completion of the New College program.

B. Student Life Studies Program

Recognizing that many experiences which may have a significant impact on student development are not necessarily structured learning activities, Berte and Upshaw (1971) suggest that Student Life Studies can identify significant factors in education not measured by traditional tests.⁴ Consequently, a Student Life Studies Program is a part of evaluation of the New College. This research approach has been utilized by other institutions with some success, notably Ottawa University where both individuals served previously as staff members.

Small groups of students (approximately ten) will be randomly chosen from the New College so as to represent all of the interdisciplinary seminars. Similar groups representing the various schools and colleges will be randomly chosen from the parent University to serve as a comparison group.

Through weekly meetings of small groups of students with faculty, community or staff persons including Undergraduate and Graduate Interns, data will be gathered about experiences students are having and the impact of these experiences on the students' de-

velopment. Prior to Student Life Studies meetings, the leaders of these groups will be assisted in developing their sensitivity to group process and their ability to select details from discussion which seem pertinent to evaluating educational programs.

Leaders will spend the first few meetings trying to establish a climate of trust and openness within the group and assuring individual members that their names will not be identified with comments made in the group. The research orientation will be stressed so that group meetings do not become "gripe sessions." Rather, a problem-solving, task-oriented approach will be used. If someone has a complaint about a particular situation or policy, the group will be asked for suggestions or possible improvements. This not only will serve to alleviate the gripe session atmosphere, but also will allow the students to feel more a part of the process of change at the University.

Selected group leaders will be known on campus as persons who are open to students. So as not to contaminate the research responsibility of the group leader, he or she will be encouraged to act as a "participant-observer;" i.e., to encourage students to evaluate their own personal growth and seek to identify possible influences, negative and positive, during their college years. The role of participant-observer will be suggested for everyone as an alternative to a role of spokesman for any campus constituency. This helps to facilitate an atmosphere of openness and acceptance within the group (Berte and Upshaw, 1971).

The material will be used to implement changes where justified and to provide a basic data bank of relevant experiences in and out of the University community as perceived by students. Student reports on the value of the group will be collected and tabulated and referred to appropriate administrative and faculty groups; the results will be analyzed in terms of impact on the student and the University and identification of critical factors in behavioral growth and development. The data from a pilot project completed in the spring of 1971 yielded some interim reports and a composite report is now being analyzed.

C. Off-Campus Learning Experiences

Any off-campus learning experience should start with a proposal from the student involved (a sort of independent study approach). Included in the proposal from the student should be a section explaining why the off-campus activity is desirable. A second and highly important section should detail the student's expected outcomes expressed in objective terms. For

example, the student should be encouraged to recognize whether this experience would be primarily a source of new information, or perhaps develop needed skills, provide an exposure to his vocational interest, or change his attitude toward or his appreciation for something. As it is quite conceivable that the student may desire to receive credit in more than one academic area, he should, as part of his proposal, decide in what areas academic credit may be appropriate. Each area in which credit is desired might then supply one faculty member to review the student's proposal in a meeting with the student. For example, if the student should decide on an off-campus involvement with emotionally disturbed children in a low income area, faculty representatives from departments of psychology, sociology, and social work may examine the proposal with the student. During this meeting, tentative agreement regarding the amount of credit to be earned may be reached.

The necessity for having some prior agreement between the student and an appropriate staff member as to the criteria required to earn the academic credit cannot be overemphasized. Not only does this agreement provide the student with some sense of direction, but it aides the institution in maintaining its educational integrity. During the course of the off-campus experience, contact with the student is maintained through journals, visits and correspondence. If facilities are available, the use of tape cassettes might be utilized for feedback purposes. At the end of the off-campus learning experience, the student should be able to demonstrate what he has learned. The student should be significantly aided in his understanding of his new knowledge by a staff member trained to interpret the off-campus experience. Because of the nature of this type of learning experience, it is recommended that a non-punitive grading system such as pass/no credit be employed for certifying credit.

The final evaluation should take into consideration such things as the student's self-evaluation, his written reports, faculty reactions to the experiences, and the information presented in seminars and during consultations. Consideration for the final evaluation might include the following:

- Was the off-campus learning more valuable than a traditional educational experience? If so, how?
- Should the off-campus experience be an elective or should it be required for some curricula?
- Were anticipated learning objectives accomplished?

- By which methods was the off-campus experience most effectively interpreted to the student?
- What types of off-campus experiences are workable and which types are of little or no value?

D. Some Unobtrusive Measures

Since the New College has a basic mandate to influence the University in the direction of educational innovation and reform, it is necessary to measure some variables that might give evidence of the New College impact. The following may provide some examples of indirect measures of the effect of the New College on the University:

- 1) Enrollment figures—patterns for the University and for various colleges and departments;
- 2) Faculty applications to teach in the New College;
- 3) Student applications to enroll in the New College;
- 4) Requests for bulletins from students, parents, etc. (Arts and Sciences Bulletin, New College Bulletin, Social Work Bulletin, etc.);
- 5) Write-ups of the New College in University publications (newspapers, magazines, yearbook, faculty-staff reports, etc.);
- 6) Transfers from schools and divisions within the University;
- 7) Attrition of students, faculty and staff; and
- 8) Visits by representatives of other institutions and requests for information about the New College.

These data may be evaluated and profiles drawn to provide a picture of growth and interest in the New College.

The following measures will be analyzed and evaluated to indicate the impact of the New College in the community:

- 1) Number of write-ups in community newspapers, etc.
- 2) Number of talks by New College staff, faculty and students;
- 3) Number of invitations to give talks;
- 4) Number of inquiries about the New College;
- 5) Number of trips made concerning the New College; and
- 6) Number of radio and TV presentations or reports on the New College.

E. Evaluation by Consultants

In order to attain the highest degree of objective

assessment, an evaluation team, composed of experts in higher education experimental programs, visits the New College twice a year. After reviewing available collected data, observing the educational operations, and meeting with students, staff, and administrators, the team submits an evaluation report. This document is used as a part of the effort to improve the New College educational program.

The New College has been fortunate to have during the past year visitors such as Dr. Harold Hodgkinson, Project Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley; Dr. Reamer Kline, President of Bard College and Chairman of the Board of the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities; Dr. David Riesman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education; and a staff person from the Newman Task Force. The New College hopes to continue to draw on the services of individuals such as these as well as others to be made available through the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities which the New College has recently joined.

F. Faculty Development and Evaluation

New College faculty members are evaluated twice each semester by their students, at mid-term and at the end of the semester. The instructor is rated on a scale which utilizes a continuum with extremes representing least and most desirable characteristics. The qualities evaluated include organization of course, teaching skill, preparation, enthusiasm and interest, clarity and reasonableness of assignments, judgment of values, class discussion and questioning, ability to communicate, mastery of content, poise and self-confidence, integration of knowledge, and the impact of the professor upon the personal growth of each student.

Students are also asked to evaluate their own progress in the course, to indicate whether they would recommend the course to others for specified purposes, and to assess the value of the course as it contributes to their professional, general, or personal growth.

The results of the mid-semester evaluation are made available to the instructor concerned in order that he may make adjustments where appropriate and to indicate to him the students' perceptions of their course and their professor. The final evaluation by students serves as a basis for an end-of-semester conference between the instructor and the Dean of the New College for purposes of re-hiring, promotion and salary increment.

Staff members are added with regard to the advising needs and projections for enrollment in the interdisciplinary seminars. Consequently, an attempt is made to gather persons with interdisciplinary backgrounds and advising skills. Presently, one faculty member has an undergraduate degree in mathematics and physics from Harvard and a Ph.D. in Scandinavian and Victorian literature from the University of Virginia. Another holds a Ph.D. in psychology and has had considerable exposure to sociology with experience in prison reform. Teaching areas of other individuals on the staff include humanities and religion, political science, literature and education.

G. Faculty Evaluation of Student Development

In each of the interdisciplinary seminars, faculty members are asked to evaluate the student in two areas during the course of the semester. These two areas include the cognitive and affective areas of development. The traditional factors in cognitive taxonomies such as knowledge in critical thinking, tools and skills, etc., are included in this evaluation process. Affective areas which are ideally rated mutually by the student and the faculty member leading the interdisciplinary seminar include motivation, ability to define goals, self-discipline, attitudes, appreciation, ability to evaluate efforts and social development. These evaluations become a part of the material available to the student's Contract-Advising Committee for purposes of overall evaluation of the student's performance and development of an educational program on a semester-by-semester basis.

IV. Concern for External Relations

It is believed that graduation from the New College will not jeopardize the student's possibilities for further study or employment. This belief is based upon contacts with various persons throughout the state and region who normally receive graduates from The University of Alabama. Support for this also comes from visits by the Dean of the New College under a Title III grant a few years ago to a number of experimental colleges. In fact, by careful attention to certain basic professional and graduate requirements, the Contract-Advising format may provide the student with a vehicle for obtaining an even broader base of preparation.

The staff of the New College has been able to work out a relationship with the College of Education on the campus so that the interdisciplinary seminars offered in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences count towards certification requirements for a teacher's certificate so that a student does not have to duplicate course work

elsewhere in these three areas after having completed the seminars. Discussions with the staffs of the medical school and the law school which receive most of The University of Alabama graduates indicate at least equal interest in New College graduates, if not more so in some cases, due to the fact that more responsibility has been placed on the student during his undergraduate years. Since the student has an opportunity through the depth study program to preserve basic courses as far as specified course requirements for graduate study, e.g., statistics if a student is going on to graduate school in psychology, no major difficulty is anticipated. It does appear, however, that explanation as to what occurred in the interdisciplinary seminars will be helpful for graduate school interpretation for admission of New College graduates. Preliminary research here and elsewhere seems to indicate that larger businesses and industries usually are going to provide their new employees with necessary specialized training soon after hiring so that coming from a more individualized program may not present a difficulty. It would appear that smaller businesses and industries prefer the individual to come through a fairly traditional business program. The most difficulty seems to be in meeting certain rigid certification requirements for some national professional societies: the student is often forced to make a decision as to whether he would like to be certified by such a professional organization or would prefer more flexibility in his program.

The staff has been encouraged by the interest on the part of faculty, students, alumni, and various individuals in the program. There are a number of inquiries weekly from faculty members at The University of Alabama and elsewhere to affiliate with and teach in this type of innovative educational programs.

Increasingly, faculty members who express an interest to teach seem to also be saying that they are more concerned with being an effective undergraduate teacher than in placing priority on research and publication. Although this is the first full year of operation of the New College, approximately 135 individuals from on and off campus, including faculty members and persons from the community, have been involved in seminar participation and planning, contract-advising sessions, or planning for new programs.

An Advisory Board composed of persons from the community, faculty and students performed a very important function during the first year of the New College in terms of interpreting and legitimizing the New College to various groups both on and off campus. At the beginning

of our second year of operation, a New College Review Committee was established with three general duties:

- 1) To function in a "sounding board" or advisory capacity for the New College staff with regard to general policy matters and procedural questions brought to the committee by the Dean of the New College;
- 2) To assist the New College staff in interpreting for and explaining to those inside and outside the campus community the role and responsibilities of the New College; and
- 3) To assist the New College staff, primarily on an individual or small group basis, with specific tasks uniquely suited to the special talents of individual committee members.

This New College Review Committee reviews any depth study program that does not fit into traditional disciplinary structures. This Committee represents all colleges of the University and includes persons in Arts and Sciences from the humanities, social sciences, and physical and biological sciences since these reflect the New College general education areas. These committees have been of immeasurable assistance both in formal and informal ways.

It is believed that relationships with the outside community have been good because a number of these individuals have been made aware of and have been involved in the New College program. Possibly the biggest contributing factor here is the fact that the New College actively seeks motivated students and has a commitment to a cross-section of individuals in terms of life style, male-female, black-white, vocational goals and ability levels. Students then do not represent a stereotype to persons in the community. Present community relations efforts are concerned with interpreting the function of the New College. Local community members are directly involved in the New College and have even assisted with admission interviews, contract-advising sessions and setting up other opportunities to interpret the program to various groups around the state.

The Dean of the New College (or another staff member) always includes students in making presentations to various alumni or civic groups. Since September, 1970, roughly 85 presentations have been made by various New College teams including TV appearances, speeches to Rotary, Lions Club, Kiwanis, alumni club presentations, state meetings of teachers of social sciences, newspaper teams on campus, the Chamber of Commerce Board of Tuscaloosa, and state meetings of high school counselors.

Finally, there has been considerable national interest in the New College program. In the last year, self-study teams from a number of institutions have visited, including the University of Missouri, University of Iowa, Davis and Elkins College, and Fairleigh Dickinson University. Others coming to campus include a representative of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, the Union for Experimenting College and Universities, and Malcolm Scully of the "Chronicle of Higher Education." To date, 105 requests for information on the New College have been received from other institutions with each of these persons receiving full copies of all New College materials.

**V. Summary Based Upon Individual Student Interviews
Throughout the Course of the Fall Semester of the 1971-72 Academic Year and End-of-Semester seminar Discussions**

It appears that an overwhelming majority of students are satisfied with their experiences in the New College for two primary reasons: 1) their participation in a new form of learning through the interdisciplinary seminar dealing with contemporary problems; and 2) the feeling that they can turn to some individuals who care about their educational future and about them as persons through the contract-advising process.

Similarly, as related to the second purpose of the New College, "to facilitate change across the University," there have been a number of developments which may or may not have a direct relationship to the New College including:

- 1) Reports from various faculty members that they were able to get their divisions to accept new course proposals because of a feeling that if it didn't happen in their division it may be able to be done through the New College
- 2) Evidence of more interdisciplinary attempts among departments and divisions on the campus to co-operate with other divisions and through the New College to develop various courses and programs (for example, an interdisciplinary course in the humanities developed through the New College with various individuals in the College of Arts and Sciences)
- 3) A statement to the Business College faculty by the new Dean of the College of Business that he would like to create his own "New College" in the College of Commerce and Business Administration
- 4) Various forms and materials from the New College have been distributed for use to other divisions such as guidelines for independent study
- 5) Students report that the Honors College within the

College of Arts and Sciences has become a much more individualized program

- 6) Faculty members continue to come to the New College with new course ideas although our approach is to have them return to their divisions and work through the possibilities for change in their own division
- 7) Major reorganization in the College of Education has taken place so that departments have been eliminated and five areas of organization are now in effect. Faculty members from the College of Education have expressed the feeling that this reorganization may have been more palatable because of the feeling that these types of interdisciplinary approaches were the trend; some said this because of their involvement in New College contract-advising and other activities
- 8) We are working with the student government to establish in each division of the University one office where students may go to find out opportunities for out-of-class learning experiences
- 9) Through the ACTION program we have initiated discussions with each division of the University for awarding academic credit for out-of-class learning experiences. Students will be placed in low-income volunteer placements for a year's academic credit in three counties near The University of Alabama campus. This has provided an excellent opportunity to discuss new forms of learning with various faculty groups on the campus.

A few other programs should be mentioned which fall outside of the individualized curricular program of the New College although they are sponsored by the New College. Last year a senior student in Arts and Sciences was hired as an Undergraduate Intern in the New College. He participated in the planning of the New College program, in the hiring of faculty members, and spoke to various groups on and off campus to explain and interpret the New College. For the current academic year, this undergraduate intern experience was accepted by fifteen other key administrators at the University. We completed our first semester's operation of this program with fifteen student participants, and sixteen students are involved now during the spring term. Each administrative officer agreed to provide his intern with high-level experiences through participation in policy and decision-making activities in that particular administrative office. Students were placed in offices from that of the President to the Academic Deans and other administrative officers on the campus. They receive independent study credit

through the New College and engage in a series of readings and weekly meetings throughout the year to discuss higher education in general and the administrative activity of their placement more specifically.

Another program implemented in the spring semester as a part of the social science interdisciplinary seminar deals with additional outreach activities in the community. Task force groups of students are working in the Bryce Hospital behavior modification program which is a small treatment program at the state mental hospital run by students and conducted with the assistance of the Bryce Hospital Treatment Team. Other students are working with the local Veterans' Hospital in a series of transition seminars for Vietnam veterans to assist these individuals with adjustment problems as they return from Southeast Asia. A similar program is with the Tuscaloosa Police Department so that the students may become involved with various phases of law enforcement.

During the fall semester, students were involved in an oral history project in Greene County, Alabama, which Peter Schrag of *Saturday Review* says has already yielded enough rich data for a number of publications. Students were given training in sampling and interview techniques, data gathering, and an exposure to the cultural background of the area prior to entering the county to talk with various individuals, black and white, for purposes of gathering data for this oral history project.

The New College suffers from a number of maladies which need additional work. Some of these include:

- 1) The problem of limited resources which touches all areas in terms of program development, faculty resources, evaluation monies and staff assistance to properly engage in out-of-class learning experiences;
- 2) The potential for difficulty in terms of the students being out in the community in various kinds of outreach activities from the ACTION program to other forms of out-of-class learning for credit;
- 3) The need for the development of a special orientation program to assist students to be able to better understand the many dimensions of the New College program as they make the transition from high school to the University;
- 4) The controversy among New College community members regarding whether the emphasis for admission should be on current students already attending the University who are unhappy with where they are or on bringing new students to the University through the New College program;
- 5) The continuing problem of interpretation of the

- New College in the state, region and on the campus; and
- 6) A concern for being open and flexible to new approaches so that we do not institutionalize this program but rather remain receptive to new approaches to learning.

In summary, the New College is not without its difficulties. It is hoped, however, that through the active and direct involvement of students, faculty, and members of the community that a continuing evaluation of the New College will occur so that the successful features of this program may be further developed and the unproductive aspects may be deleted. Through these efforts the New College intends to continue to represent a viable, alternative approach to learning for students and a catalyst for the reform of undergraduate education.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond the High School*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

² Lewis B. Mayhew. *The Literature of Higher Education 1971*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

³ Harold L. Hodgkinson *Institutions in Transition: A Study of Change in Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

⁴ Neal R. Berte and Charles Upshaw. "Student Life Studies: An Action Research Option." *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal*, Vol. IX, No. 1 (July, 1971), pp. 77-80.

Florida Presbyterian College

John Jacobson, Dean

Florida Presbyterian College accepted its first class in fall 1960. From the beginning, the college was committed to excellence and to innovation. Some of our early successes in these areas were:

1. A four-year interdisciplinary Core program taken by all students.
2. The first Winter Term (Interim Term, January Term) offered anywhere in the country.
3. The highest rate of faculty compensation in the State of Florida.
4. By traditional standards, the most highly selective student body in the State of Florida.

Number three and number four have not been consistently maintained, but were important in setting the tone during the early years. Since its beginning, the College has been committed to the importance of interdisciplinary study, independent study, international education, and the establishment of a strong sense of community among all constituencies of the college. At the present, several of our programs can be regarded as experimental. These are:

- I. Jefferson House
- II. Community Practica
- III. College Assembly
- IV. Afro-American Studies
- V. London Semester

With respect to number I, answers to the Guideline questions are given below. Numbers II, III, IV and V are experimental for us and highly significant for us, but will not be described at length.

II. Community Practica. The Community Practica program places students in service, research or action projects in communities of Pinellas County. The program is coordinated by a faculty-student committee. Student involvement may be purely voluntary or it may relate to a course of study that carries course credit.

This program has been initiated with a minimum of institutional expense. The weight has been borne by those faculty who were strongly committed to the idea. The program has occasioned a major debate within the faculty as to the objec-

tives of the college. A group of faculty have argued that the practica improperly give course credit for non-academic activities. At the other extreme, some faculty and some students feel that there is too great emphasis upon theoretical material and not enough value placed upon sheer field experience. This is a growing edge and there is evidence that the growth may be painful.

III. College Assembly. In the spring of 1969 the faculty approved the institution of the College Assembly as an experiment in College governance. The Assembly has responsibility for making final decisions on matters of academic and social policy. Its membership consists of about 80 faculty members (all the faculty members), 35 students, and six non-faculty administrators. The Constitution was brief and rather imprecise, on purpose. During the last two years the Assembly has made major changes in social policy on campus and has also abolished the language requirement for graduation. Over the past few months, faculty scepticism about the Assembly has risen with the result that when it came time to adopt a more precise Constitution this fall, the Constitution that the faculty approved seemed to the student leaders to be too restrictive and is encountering some difficulty as it is put before the students for their ratification.

The educational objective of the Assembly is to spread information and stimulate thought among students on educational issues by involving them directly in decision making. The underlying philosophy is the classical liberal philosophy that people will inform themselves and act responsibly if they have a means of influencing what happens.

IV. Afro-American Studies. The Afro-American Studies Program was initiated this fall with the addition of two faculty members, one a specialist in Afro-American History and the other a specialist in African History and Politics. The initiation of this program coincided with a jump in enrollment of Afro-American students from 27 to 57, and the college is continuing toward an ultimate goal of 10% Afro-American students. (Our student body is now 1,100.)

V. London Semester. The London Semester Program sends 25-30 of our students each semester to take up residence in a house we have leased on Gower Street. They are accompanied by one of our professors and spend the semester doing courses by independent study or directed study with professors back on the campus at FPC. Their Core program is supervised directly by the resident director, however.

The remainder of this paper contains answers to the Guide-line questions for item Number I.

I. Jefferson House.

1. The primary educational objective is the construction of a four-year course of study that will be closely adapted

to the needs and interests of students who are fairly clear about what they want to learn. The basic philosophy underlying this objective is that students learn best what they really want to learn and that a program tailored by the student and a group of sympathetic professors is likely to be superior to one specified in the abstract. All of the resources of the institution are freely available to Jefferson House students and faculty. In addition, \$2,000 to \$4,000 of additional funds have been made available each year. These funds have been consistently underexpended. This program will not increase significantly in size. It started with about 60 student and six professors, and now has about 90 students and nine professors. I believe it is hard to generalize about optimal size for experimental efforts. This size has been very good for us, considering the total size of our institution and the kind of students and faculty we have.

Hardening of the arteries can begin very quickly with a program of this kind in the sense that it represents a change that is nearly irreversible. The tide is running very strongly toward unmitigated individualism, and once a program like this is in effect, it is impossible to move in the direction of a common educational experience for all students.

This program contains structural elements that institutionalize change that were lacking in an earlier experimental effort of ours along similar lines. The key element is that the faculty has agreed to award degrees on the basis of four years of study and a program certified by the Fellows of Jefferson House. This gives Jefferson House students absolute immunity from other graduation requirements.

This program helps to meet the needs of some minority group students in that it makes possible the structuring of total programs of study around problems of social change, which are naturally of great interest right now to many minority group students. The contribution that this makes to undergraduate education may be that it shows one way in which requirements can be abandoned without sacrificing institutional commitment to the ideal of balanced and coherent academic programs.

2. Perhaps the most significant learning experience is the experience of working out a four-year program of study in detail and defending it before a sympathetic but discriminating group of professors. Jefferson House is actually the most thorough program of advising that I know about. In order to graduate from the College, a Jefferson House student has to have spent four full years in college and to have satisfied the Fellows of Jefferson House that he has completed a worthy program of college study.

3. Jefferson House is an intensification of the college's earlier commitment to independent study. The whole college program is worked out independently rather than being preprogrammed. Jefferson House students do take courses, but they also take a lot of independent study work. Like other students who take independent study, they work out an independent study contract with the sponsoring professor.
4. At the end of each term, the faculty in Jefferson House meet to evaluate the progress of each of the Jefferson House students. They write up progress reports on each of the students, which are then shared with the students.
5. The faculty in Jefferson House are rather senior faculty who are already tenured. Their course load is adjusted in individual courses if the Jefferson House advising becomes too onerous. They educate each other in the operation of Jefferson House by meetings with each other and with students.
6. Since we have an off-beat grading system, we have always had to take pains to explain our transcripts to graduate schools and employers. This takes time, and is annoying, but is not an insuperable program. Jefferson House students tend to be attracted to flexible graduate programs like the ILA at Emory. Jefferson House gives us no problems with alumni, legislature, city council, federal government, foundations or anyone else. Career risks to students are minimal, providing they construct for themselves a program that will fit them to do what they want to do. Career risks for the faculty in Jefferson House are minimal, since these men are men who are tenured, well-established, and rather senior in terms of age and service. Successful innovations can be disseminated most effectively by journal articles, conferences, and most importantly, site visits.

Livingston College, Rutgers University

Ernest Lynton, Dean

Livingston College of Rutgers University differs fundamentally from most so-called experimental colleges in that it is a major division of the University, and that it would exist independently of the degree of its innovations. In other words, what is basically at stake is not the viability and the existence of Livingston College as such, but rather the degree to which it can continue to be innovative and experimental.

Working, by design and choice, within the basic fiscal and other limitations of a unit within a major State University, Livingston College has set itself the task of becoming a replicable model for university colleges anywhere. Specifically, it is tackling the question of the ways in which such instructional units must respond to what is rapidly becoming compulsory higher education.

It is not the purpose of this brief report to present a catalogue of Livingston's plans, activities and accomplishments. But the College's general directions can be summarized in two ways.

One basic feature of Livingston College is its recognition that higher education has become quasi-compulsory, and that this requires that public institutions must serve a much broader and more heterogeneous population than used to be the case. The College sees this not as an unavoidable burden, but as a positive and exciting opportunity. The real challenge to an educational institution does not only lie in taking the highly selected, already well-trained and motivated product of good high schools and giving them a further layer of education. The real test of value of an institution lies in its ability to take students whose native ability has not been developed, and to help them reach the highest levels of knowledge and understanding.

All of Livingston's students have high potential for ultimate achievement, but many have had inadequate high school preparation. These the College attempts to provide with the support they need to reach their full potential.

Livingston College is strongly dedicated to educating students of very diverse backgrounds, and recognizes that this also requires an equally diverse faculty and staff. It has become one of the very few truly multiracial colleges in this country, with one third of its student body, one fourth of its faculty, and one half of its administration non-white.

There has been considerable and gratifying progress toward interracial cooperation—e.g., there now exists on the campus three Martin Luther King houses dedicated to this, in which blacks, Puerto Ricans, and whites live together by conscious choice. More and more activities attract all segments of the college population, and this is becoming the rule rather than the exception. Of course there continue to exist tension and hostility, and there will have to be considerable changes in this country's social climate before the different racial and ethnic groups can really live together in complete harmony. But Livingston is an example—one of the very few—that there can be at least peaceful coexistence and much individual contact.

At the same time, Livingston College is also responding to the changing demands on higher education in its development of courses, curricula, and programs. As the economy moves toward an even greater emphasis on service-oriented activities, both in the public and the private sector, educational programs must follow. The Livingston faculty in its scholarly work as well as in its teaching, is moving strongly toward the merging of pure and applied areas. In the social sciences with their strong emphasis on urban and developmental issues and policies, in the health related biological sciences, in computer science with its ties both to biomedical problems and to the social sciences, and in the development of communication and documentation within the Arts and in literature—in all of these as well as in other areas, Livingston College is pioneering that synthesis of liberal arts and professional subjects.

The key to our progress in this direction, of course, lies in the range of interests and involvements of the Livingston faculty, and in its remarkable quality and dedication. By every significant criterion, the College has a faculty which is second to none in the University. It is a remarkable and exciting group, spanning a wide spectrum of both traditional and innovative disciplines, and consisting of an unusual and mutually reinforcing mixture of persons having conventional academic backgrounds with those coming from professional and practical experiences. Both the high quality and the rich variety of the faculty is being reflected in Livingston's curriculum, which by now is really beginning to take shape, and which is described with reasonable accuracy in this year's revised catalogue.

This lists a wide range of programs, including not only many standard subjects, but also community development, urban planning, computer science, labor studies, Puerto Rican, Afro-American, and African studies, and urban teacher education. Most of these are strongly interdisciplinary, and take advantage of the issue and policy orientation of the curriculum in the social sciences and other disciplines.

Livingston College has by now achieved a considerable degree of coherence with regard to its general objectives and

commitments. But having in three years already grown to 2500 students, and expecting to double this in another few years, it is highly heterogeneous in educational style and method. Hence no single or simple statement can be made with regard to student learning experiences or to instructional approaches.

Hampshire College

Robert Birney, Vice President

Introduction

Hampshire College opened with its first class of students in the fall of 1970, and now has 647 students, primarily concentrated in their first and second years of study. Hampshire was founded as a place which would continually carry out experiments in higher education for undergraduate liberal arts. The organizational structure of the College is designed to support and maintain that purpose and as such embodies a configuration of practices which in combination may be said to constitute an experiment in its own right. These structures and practices consist of having divisional Schools, rather than departments; employing faculty by contract, rather than under a tenure system; using a periodic examination procedure, rather than course grades and credit hours, requiring the student to determine the time of examination, and thus placing the timing of progress with the student; and emphasizing continual curriculum development with an aim toward the dissemination of courses designed and tested with Hampshire College students. These conditions and many others were adopted in an effort to provide the opportunity for continuous experimentation.

The College curriculum itself embodies several teaching programs, all of which are considered innovations, and which will be subject to evaluation. The evaluation practices fall into two general categories. First, continuous evaluation drawn from written reports by students about themselves and their courses, from teachers about their students, and about their own effectiveness, and from members of the community and beyond the community who are asked to contribute to the evaluation of faculty at the time of their request for reappointment under their contracts. These forms of evaluation are standard with the Institution. The second form of evaluation consists of the carefully designed assessment program to be carried out by the Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation so we might have a better idea of the strengths and weaknesses of any particular program or course. A good count of the various programs suggests approximately fifteen such units which might be evaluated. At present only three have made a serious start toward assessing their effectiveness by the use of systematic procedures at the hands of evaluators from outside the program itself. The Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation has not yet been staffed, and these outside evalua-

tors have tended to be part time persons hired from neighboring institutions.

Selected Innovations

Hampshire College has adopted a first year curriculum patterned along the lines set out in the original planning documents for a new college, as expressed in the monograph by C. L. Barber, *More Power to Them*. Barber suggested that seminar-sized sections could be used to teach students how best to inquire into subject matters. The notion of inquiry was embodied in *The Making of a College* by Franklin Patterson and Charles Longsworth, and now motivates the teaching in the Division I courses. Teachers are told in Division I that they are free to present any material they wish without prescription from their School. The result is a wide *pot pourri* of topics and subjects from which students are expected to select two each from the Schools of Humanities and Arts, Natural Science and Mathematics, Social Science, and one course from the program in Language and Communication. Teachers in these courses attempt to illustrate for students by dealing with selected topics the nature of the inquiry which scholars from wide disciplines bring to a particular aspect of experience. A student then constructs a Division I examination in consultation with his teachers, and presents it to an examination committee from each School for approval. If approved, the student then stands for examination before examiners who may be drawn from the faculty, members of his own class, or persons outside the Institution.

As indicated earlier, rather continuous internal evaluation is made of the effectiveness of the Division I courses. In Hampshire's second year, it appears that the following areas must be strengthened.

First, faculty advisers to students must work more closely with them, helping them use their Division I experience in construction of examinations. The rate of examination has been slower than expected, and it appears there are several obstacles to students moving at an acceptable pace through their School Division I exams.

A second area of difficulty lies in acquainting each successive wave of incoming teachers with the means and purposes of Division I courses. Some students complained that their efforts to achieve the goals set out in the courses are frustrated by practices and requirements by teachers which do not reflect the focus upon inquiry.

Third, many students at the end of the first course report that they are only beginning to see what was required of them, and they feel they should take a third, rather than only two Division I courses, to be adequately prepared. This realization by the students and its conclusion contributes to the delay in taking Division I exams.

It is at this writing too early to tell how closely we will

achieve our goals for the Division I courses, but we take heart from the clarity with which we have been able to identify our difficulties, and our sense of progress in overcoming them. Faculty have responded in part by creating teaching seminars for themselves where they share their experience with successful and unsuccessful methods and techniques, which is slowly leading to a clearer definition of what is meant by the emphasis on the art of inquiry.

Presumably, the student evaluations of these courses and if their own experience in the course may be combined with those of the teachers of the courses to provide basic data which will in turn be formally evaluated by outside investigators. These reports plus the actual performances submitted for the examinations should provide a means for assessing the effectiveness of course work.

A second innovative program for which evaluation has begun is the Law Program. This is an example of the organization of the curriculum into emphases or areas led by a senior person, usually occupying a funded chair, with one or two junior persons combining their efforts with other faculty to provide a dozen or more courses focused upon a single area. The Law Program is staffed by 1.67 FTE lawyers, and courses are contributed by sociologists, anthropologists, and ecologists. By the end of the first year, the program was evaluated by a person hired for that purpose who interviewed in depth all of the students and teachers taking part. The original funding grant for this program is five years, and we hope to focus some of the efforts of the Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation on the program before long. There are numerous dimensions to the program which must be developed, tried, assessed, and improved. For example, students visit the local courts as observers, are developing advisory services for young people in detention halls and juvenile installations, and observe various public interest law firms or trial situations. The development of these field sites, both locally and in more distant places, places special demands on the faculty. We have been quite aware that the logistics of movement and placement would place restraints on the effectiveness of field work, and we will be assessing the law program for the way in which it has been able to overcome these obstacles. One of the major hopes of the law program is that it can establish the scholarship of legal literature as having a legitimate place in undergraduate liberal arts. Therefore we shall keep a sharp watch on the extent to which it appears to be serving solely as a pre-law conduit as opposed to a program serving the needs of a wide ranging group of students.

Environmental Quality Program

This program has included faculty members from all three Schools and is using a rather unique format in its approach to environmental problems. Students enroll in the program

as a whole without being committed to a particular topic of study. The first few weeks of the course are devoted to a series of lectures and to conversations between students and faculty which lay out the full range of the program. Students then choose one of five or six particular seminars, ranging from public health to urban economics to air pollution, in which they will be involved in projects and in field work in the nearby city of Holyoke. The program is open to students in both Division I and Division II, with the nature of the projects depending upon the students' preparation and background. The variety of field work projects and the freedom of students to move around in the program has led to the possibility of confusion for students (some of whom have dropped out of participation) as well as to a considerable sense of enrichment for many of them. At the moment, no external evaluation has been attempted for this program, but it illustrates one in which the evaluation methods will have to be complex and sophisticated since the informants will range from hospital personnel, Department of Public Works personnel, local model cities officials, local citizens, as well as the normal constituencies which bear on our curricular efforts.

Conclusion

In light of our new beginnings, it is not possible to state that we have carefully designed methods of evaluation being brought to bear on equally carefully designed curricular programs. Rather the entire enterprise is new to us, and we are attempting to both create and evaluate simultaneously, always a difficult and frustrating situation. Nevertheless, the three programs above illustrate various levels of effectiveness.

University of California, Santa Cruz

**Lloyd J. Ring
Executive Assistant to the Chancellor**

Santa Cruz is not an "experimental college." It is a general campus of the University of California and its purposes, values, and quality reflect those of the University. Nor are any of the six colleges on the campus "experimental colleges," for their roots are firmly embedded in the liberal arts tradition. Santa Cruz is more than an experiment. It is a bold attempt by a public university to improve the quality of undergraduate education.

While Santa Cruz and its colleges may not be termed "experimental," it is indeed different—perhaps unique—in public higher education. From its inception, the campus has been developed on a novel design. The residential college, rather than the traditional academic department, is the basic unit of planning and of student and faculty identification. The colleges share a common commitment to quality undergraduate teaching, close relationships among students and faculty, and the maintenance of a vital academic community that remains small while the campus grows large.

Each college is a "mini-campus" with its own distinctive architecture which includes patios, walkways, classrooms, lounges, dining hall, faculty offices, a small library, recreational facilities, and student housing for two-thirds of its undergraduates. Each college is headed by a Provost who lives on campus. The Fellows or faculty members of each college come from many disciplines and with the Provost plan a program of courses which gives the college a particular distinctiveness or intellectual "center of gravity." Each college has its own traditions and precedents but each college is continually evolving and changing as students and faculty enter and depart.

The colleges are not, however, solely or even mainly responsible for undergraduate instruction. Each college Fellow is simultaneously a member of a board of studies or discipline which extends across all colleges. Boards of studies set criteria for disciplinary majors, initiate graduate programs, and safeguard the maintenance of high academic standards for the disciplines. Academically, boards of studies are somewhat analogous to departments on other campuses but there are major administrative differences. Boards of studies are clustered into three Divisions—Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences—and each Division is headed by a Vice Chan-

cellor who has administrative and budgetary responsibility for all of the boards of studies within the Division. Furthermore, secretarial services are provided by a secretarial pool which is financed campus-wide. Services are provided wherever faculty are located.

This dual structure is supported by a budgetary device which places one half of each faculty salary in a college and the other half in a division. Unlike the University of California, San Diego, Kent, Lancaster, La Trobe, and other institutions that have developed colleges, UCSC colleges have money to "buy" faculty time for undergraduate work. A faculty member is both a Fellow of a college and a member of a board of studies within a division. The collegiate structure provides the benefits of a small college and permits faculty and students in close association to shape and to influence their own environment. The collegiate structure also facilitates interdisciplinary learning and research by bringing together members of various disciplines. It also creates a feeling of belonging and intimacy for both students and faculty. The divisional structure, on the other hand, provides the advantages and depth of study available in a university. It also supports and encourages excellence in scholarship and the search for new knowledge. Students normally take courses in several boards of studies and in other colleges as well as in their own college.

Neither the budgetary device of splitting appointments nor the fact that the same individuals are simultaneously part of a college and part of a board of studies eliminates tension between the two structures. College programs are less clearly defined, are usually interdisciplinary, and often enter areas quite outside the expertise of some faculty members. Full participation in the academic program and the social life of the college is difficult to sustain. Disciplinary programs are more clearly defined, are judged by external standards, and have an uncontrollable tendency to proliferate. Actual experience at Santa Cruz has shown that colleges offer about 17% of the total number of courses while boards of studies offer 77% of the total. (The remaining 6% are physical education and recreational courses which are non-credit.)

This dual structure, aimed at capturing the best features of the small college and of the university, has been nurtured and supported by being able to start from scratch, on a magnificent 2000 acre site and by the recruitment of a faculty singularly devoted to undergraduate teaching and to the "idea" of Santa Cruz.

1. Purpose:

Santa Cruz was conceived by Dean E. McHenry and former President of the University of California, Clark Kerr. It was a response to and an alternative for the "multiversity" with its alienation and inhumaneness. The concept capitalized on the

values of the small liberal arts college for undergraduates by embedding it within the richness of the large university. The model borrowed heavily from the British institutions as well as American institutions like Harvard and the Claremont Colleges.

The primary educational objectives of the campus emanate from the concepts and models on which the campus was built. Emphasis on the residential nature of the colleges was a deliberate attempt to integrate and strengthen the bonds between living experiences and learning experiences. The residential aspect of the campus also fosters small group development and brings to bear the influence of peers and peer groups in the growth and development of students.

The curriculum is somewhat restricted in an effort to meet student needs rather than faculty interests. Very few requirements are imposed on students but most eagerly seek a variety of intellectual challenges in each of the three divisions—Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences. Students are encouraged both in formal work and through informal relations to acquire greater self-knowledge and an informed social perspective. Extensive and intensive reading is assigned to provide an historical and philosophical perspective for students. Students must quickly learn to write with clarity, precision, and a sense of style since most student work culminates in some form of written document. (Fewer than 25% of the courses offered at Santa Cruz have traditional final examinations.) Heavy emphasis on tutorials, small seminars, and independent study forces students to develop critical thinking skills as well as concise verbal presentations and arguments.

From a financial point of view, Santa Cruz shares the same problems faced by the entire University. State support for the University has been at the same level for the past two years. Santa Cruz has continued to grow but only at the expense of the older campuses of the University and an increasing student/faculty ratio. There is little hope that state support will improve greatly in the next few years but the Santa Cruz campus will continue to have a high priority internally since it is one of the few campuses that has considerable growth potential.

The Santa Cruz campus was designed to reach a total enrollment of 27,500 students about the turn of the century. Recent census figures, however, have brought about new estimates of growth for the whole University. It now appears that Santa Cruz may not exceed 10,000 to 15,000 students—a figure that should be reached in the mid 1980's. If resources are available, the campus can expect to grow by 6 to 8 new colleges in the next ten years. This would provide a total of 12 to 14 colleges in contrast to the 20+ colleges projected earlier.

Enrollment over the past seven years has been in excess of what was planned due to the fact that more than 4 students apply for every opening that is available. To adjust to this

perennial problem, the planned enrollment figure for each college was increased in 1970-71. In spite of careful planning and control, this fall the campus is again 292 students above the three quarter average enrollment in the Academic Plan. (For planning purposes, a three quarter average enrollment figure is used since there is a normal decrease in enrollment from the fall to spring quarters.) A total of 4,084 undergraduates are currently enrolled compared to the plan for 3,792. If enrollment can be held to the planned figures, the campus is expected to grow in the following manner:

**Table 1. Planned Undergraduate Growth by Colleges,
1972-73 to 1979-80**

Year	College	Increase	Total
1972-73	College VI	373	
	College VII	300	673
1973-74	College VII	300	
	College VIII	435	735
1974-75	College VIII	400	
	College IX	300	700
1975-76	College IX	300	
	College X	350	650
1976-77	College X	350	
	College XI	350	700
1977-78	College XI	350	350
1978-79	College XII	400	400
1979-80	College XII	400	400
8 Year Total			4,608

Total undergraduate enrollment would be 8,400 in 1979-80. (As can be observed from the growth plan, colleges are opened in two stages. This has become a necessary procedure since the fourth college due to reduced budgets and an increasing lag in facility development. In most cases, opening a college at half strength and completing it the next year has been satisfactory but it does lengthen the process of stabilization by introducing so many new faculty and students to an enterprise that has just begun to develop procedures, relationships, and an identity.)

In addition to the undergraduate enrollment, the campus currently has 312 graduate students in ten graduate programs, all of which grant the Ph.D. Graduate enrollment is 13 students below the planned level at the moment and represents

7.1% of the student body. By 1979-80, graduate enrollment is expected to reach 2,200 or 20% of the total enrollment.

Discussion of an optimally effective size and rate of growth has been under way for some time. With regard to the total campus, there has developed a very strong sentiment both internally and within the campus environs, that the campus should not be allowed to reach the 27,500 enrollment originally planned. The Academic Plan Revision Committee recommended to the President and Regents that:

"The ultimate size of the Santa Cruz campus should be subjected to intensive study and a decision should be reached not later than 1975."

Using the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education as a reference, the Committee suggested an ultimate size somewhere between 10,000 and 15,000 students. Following the latest census and revision of the University's growth plan, it now appears that the campus will not exceed the 15,000 limit before the year 2000.

The optimally effective size of colleges is quite another consideration. Originally, it was hoped that colleges would accommodate between 400 and 800 students and 25 to 50 faculty members on an unweighted ratio of 16 to 1. However, the smallest college yet built was planned for 525 students and the largest was planned for 800 students. It is generally agreed by all concerned that this is an ideal range given appropriate facilities and a student/faculty ratio of 16 to 1. Decreased resources and unanticipated over-enrollment has forced the college to increase in size and decrease in student/faculty ratio to the following state:

Table 2. Planned and Actual Size of Colleges with Student/Faculty Ratios, 1971-72.

No.	College	Planned Enrollment		Fall 1971 Enrollment	F. T. E.*	Ratio**
		Original	Revised			
I	Cowell	600	720	774	40	19.3
II	Stevenson	700	770	806	45.5	17.7
III	Crown	525	590	634	36	17.6
IV	Merrill	575	615	672	35	19.2
V	College V	800	820	910	47	19.4
VI	Kresge	650	277***	288	18	16.0
		3,850	3,792	4,084	221.5	18.4

*Number of full-time equivalent faculty has fluctuated and is not directly tied to the original planned enrollment.

**Ratio is based on actual student enrollment, Fall 1971.

***Reduced to partial opening due to budget cuts and lack of facilities.

This is far from an optimally effective situation but there are too many variables involved to blame size only. The physical facilities of each college were designed for the original planned enrollment so that the revised figure and the actual figure have both contributed to overcrowding. FTE faculty were originally allocated on a 15 to 1 basis but tight budgets have not permitted faculty growth proportionate to student enrollment. Faculty involvement, both academically and co-curricularly, in the collegiate setting is normally intense but it has become exhausting.

There is general agreement that no college at Santa Cruz should greatly exceed 800 students. It is quite apparent that even when colleges have a "theme" or intellectual "center of gravity" and only 600 students there are several sub-communities that emerge. This somewhat detracts from the development of a coherent, unified college community. College VIII which has a planned enrollment of 835 will be the first to recognize this phenomenon and consciously to develop two or three "centers of gravity" and mechanisms for uniting them in an overall view of the college.

In the original academic plan for the campus, at least three professional schools would have been under development by this time. Unfortunately, the schools proposed—engineering, medicine, and business—have been deferred following state-wide estimates of needs in these areas. This has left the campus with only a liberal arts environment. Future priorities—along with the continuing development of undergraduate colleges—include a teacher education program, a human biology program tied to cooperating hospitals, a school of landscape architecture and regional planning, and a program in administration utilizing the insights of computer science, systems analysis, organization theory, behavioral science, and policy analysis. It is hoped that each of these programs will be highly innovative and that they will add new depth and maturity to the campus and to the student body.

Santa Cruz has remained "in process" from the beginning and many changes have occurred in response to new needs or changing circumstances. In its sixth year the campus administration recognized the need to concentrate on two quite different functions simultaneously. Established colleges required review and evaluation and the skills necessary to maintain and revitalize an existing social system and physical plant. The charismatic leadership and the voluntary processes which created the colleges had to be supplemented by a more efficient form of management. Each college added a Bursar or business manager to its staff to handle budgets, housing, use of facilities, etc. Decentralization of certain maintenance and grounds functions have taken place and some colleges are experimenting with student work crews in lieu of a centralized work crew. Other functions being considered for decentralization to the colleges are financial aid disbursements, aspects of student

admissions, and aspects of the Educational Opportunity Program. All of these changes have been sought by the colleges but there is little doubt that these added responsibilities will hasten "institutionalization" along with the more effective management.

With regard to the campus as a whole, the "management era" has largely eclipsed the ad hoc decision-making pattern of the past. Three new management positions have been added: Executive Vice Chancellor, Assistant Chancellor-Academic Administration, and Assistant Chancellor-Planning and Analysis. The campus has developed a number of computer-oriented management information systems all of which interface with University-wide MIS. The increasing size and complexity of the campus; the need for immediate information on finances, space and facilities; the necessity of responding to University-wide and state agency requests for information; and the growing demands for institutional accountability, preclude the luxury of casual or intermittent attention to management.

The great advantage of the Santa Cruz campus is its incremental growth by colleges. Each new idea for a college rekindles enthusiasm on the part of administrators, faculty, and students. Each new college opened ignites anew the desire of old colleges to remain vital, relevant, and "in process" rather than "finished." Colleges learn from one another and something new is being passed along at all times. Moreover, since the campus began with the collegiate pattern, the pressures on colleges are less than the pressures experienced by an "experimental college" embedded in a large, established campus. "Hardening of the arteries" at Santa Cruz will not occur through internal choice but only as the result of external pressure or lack of support.

The basic changes in undergraduate education have been institutionalized in concrete on the Santa Cruz campus. The more than 60 million dollars worth of capital improvements directly support the collegiate structure. Classroom space, which is based on state formulae, is scattered among the colleges and only the very large classrooms are centrally located. The inclusion of housing for 67% of the undergraduates in each of the first five colleges and 50% in the sixth and seventh colleges assures a commitment to residential and living/learning concepts. The very real differences among colleges in terms of intellectual "center of gravity," physical environment, social and cultural emphases, and the interests of faculty, assures a variety of options for students.

The budgetary device of splitting each faculty member's salary between the college and a discipline gives the college leverage in the appointment process, merits and promotion, and in teaching assignments. The semi-autonomous nature of the colleges further supports change because each college has a wide degree of latitude in undertaking and pursuing innovations without regard for the other colleges.

Santa Cruz has probably made its major contributions to undergraduate education through a structure that decreases student alienation, provides living/learning units on a human and humane scale, assures flexibility and a minimum of requirements and constraints for students, and emphasizes quality in instruction and learning. In a very real sense, the campus has established "elitist" goals and attracts an "elite" student body. On the other hand, without support from the state, the campus has developed an Educational Opportunity Program for disadvantaged students which now numbers 325 students or about 8% of the undergraduates. It is hoped that over the next three years this program will grow to include approximately 12% in the undergraduates.

The needs of many other groups are being met through the University Extension program of the campus. Extension serves nine neighboring counties and has extensive programs for school teachers, police officers, the blind, and those interested in learning new skills and acquiring new knowledge. Many new groups and individuals will be served as the University develops its concept of the "Extended University" and grants degrees to part-time students.

All in all, Santa Cruz represents a major reform in undergraduate education in a public university. That this reform is perceived to be positive is evidenced by the number of programs and developing campuses that have adapted various aspects of this general concept.

2. 3. Student Learning Experience and Academic Innovations:

General course requirements are minimal. "American History and Institutions" and "Subject A: English Composition" are required by the University of California but can be satisfied in a number of ways. Campus requirements are intended to assure a breadth of knowledge and each student is expected to take a minimum of three courses in each of the three divisions—Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences. Until last year, there had been a language requirement as well and with its removal, the necessity of the breadth requirements is being reconsidered. An analysis of the course work taken by the 1971 graduates of Stevenson College indicates clearly that most students take many more courses in each of the divisions than is demanded by the requirement. With the exception of humanities majors who might not take the minimum number of natural science courses, the requirements do not seem necessary to assure breadth of study.² An analysis of a campus-wide sample of graduates is anticipated to determine the necessity of imposing breadth requirements.

Colleges are permitted to establish requirements beyond those already mentioned. Cowell College requires, at both the freshman and sophomore levels, a three quarter sequence of courses called, "World Civilization." Stevenson College requires all freshmen to take a course called, "Culture and So-

society." College V requires freshmen to take a "Workshop" for any two of the three freshmen quarters. The "Workshops" have two aspects: a studio where the student creates art and a seminar where the student reads and writes about his art. Neither Crown College nor Merrill College imposes requirements on their students.

The boards of studies offer courses and majors not unlike programs at other institutions. Innovation in either content or method has been difficult to achieve. Small class size and close relations between students and faculty have been equated with and substituted for innovation. Of all courses offered since 1965, 85% have had less than 30 students. The first signs of innovation have occurred in certain introductory science courses where student enrollment outstrips the single largest classroom on campus—250 seats.

The overflow from Chemistry I of the fall quarter, 1970, was accommodated in a special section during the winter quarter. Instead of pursuing the traditional lecture, discussion, laboratory pattern, the instructor devised an approach that was to capitalize on the use of students as teachers and resources to one another. The class met as a whole once each week to discuss a statement of the week's objectives, appropriate reading, and an assigned problem. Students met in leaderless groups of six an additional two times a week. Each member of the group had to prepare a ten minute presentation of material relevant to the week's objectives to share with other members of the group. Each group member was expected to critique each of these student presentations with the critiques being turned in to the instructor weekly so he could obtain some feeling for how the groups were progressing. Each group member was also expected to bring to the group a problem that he was unable to understand or a question on the week's work that needed elaboration. To support this student-oriented process of teaching-learning, the instructor made himself available to the groups through extensive office hours and by permitting students to call him at home when they needed assistance. Examination results indicate a level of learning comparable to the traditional mode but with a somewhat higher student involvement in the subject matter.

The board of studies in Biology has not divided into the traditional specialized areas. Instead, it provides a broad perspective on all the biological sciences. Much greater emphasis is placed on student advising because most majors in biology pursue a personally tailored program. Faculty serve as resources for students. Laboratory experience is not required for non-majors so labs have been separated from the elementary courses. Those who do not take labs find that they are inquiry-oriented with students raising questions, doing background reading, studying the problem, and suggesting research approaches to get answers to the questions.

Introductory Biology has also been confronted with more students than the largest hall can accommodate. As a result, the lectures are being televised to the overflow in residence hall lounges and to individual student rooms. The video-tapes produced last year will be used this year in each of the colleges in place of the large lecture, and biologists affiliated with each college will serve as resources within the college for discussion groups and other activities related to the course.

Community Studies is a program that has several innovative aspects. First, it is an interdisciplinary field of study and there are no full-time faculty appointments in community studies. At this time, there are three appointees whose titles include "community studies," but the other half of their appointments is in sociology, literature, and politics. Other faculty associated with the program include 3 sociologists, 2 psychologists, 2 geographers, 2 political scientists, and one each in anthropology, biology, and economics.

The second innovation in this program is that it includes 6 months, full-time, off-campus field work as part of the major. This field work aspect emphasizes experiential learning as distinguished from experiencing. It also reintegrates the three functions of the University—learning, research, and service—by placing the student in the community or organizational situation for the purpose of generating data. Since the faculty has a vested interest in obtaining good data, they assist the student in every way possible to learn the skills of observation, participation, and research inquiry. The service feature is accomplished as a result of the activity in which the student and the faculty have been engaged on behalf of the organization.

The third innovation in community studies is the systematization of the relationship between the university and a small number of community agencies that would not ordinarily get university resources. The program introduces students and faculty into the agencies in a staggered fashion to assure continuity and when the project is completed, the agency has a new structure and the resources necessary to continue on its own.

The field work aspect of the program comes under very careful scrutiny and supervision. No program is undertaken until it is certain that enough students will participate over a long enough period of time to guarantee a measure of continuity and stability for the community or agency. The field work program is followed by the student writing four papers on various aspects of the learning experience. The final test for the graduation of majors is the writing of a thesis that synthesizes the learning acquired in the courses and through the field work.

The new and rapidly developing program of **Environmental Studies** assumes that education is based on the processes of

analysis and problem solving and that education must be freed from the classroom. Two small grants were obtained to launch the program, the purpose of which is to provide a learning center for active undergraduate involvement. The role of faculty members associated with the program will be to assist students in the development of projects rather than to "do their own thing." Programs undertaken to date by students of Environmental Studies include a workshop of 22 students under the leadership of a highly qualified member of the non-university community which is studying Santa Cruz County as an example of the problem of coastal access. The results of the study will be presented to the State Legislature.

A year ago a similar workshop was concerned with pollution in Santa Cruz County. The students produced a beautifully printed booklet called "Santa Cruz and the Environment." When the booklet went on sale to the public, there was a tremendous outcry because local industries and county agencies were specifically cited as being contributors to environmental pollution. After the shouting and the threat of law-suits died away, the students realized that they had much to learn about being effective agents of social change. On the other hand, there has been an increased awareness of the environment and several of the industries cited in the booklet have made efforts to correct their pollutant emissions.

The curricula of the colleges vary although each new college has in some way been influenced by the pattern of the first college—Cowell. This influence is expressed in the desire to have a "theme" or area of concern around which to build a distinctive college "core" course. Cowell College has been most successful in this respect and has maintained at both the freshman and sophomore levels a required three quarter, interdisciplinary course called "World Civilization." Many graduating seniors refer to "World Civ." as a significant aspect of their education at Santa Cruz.

There are also core courses in Stevenson College, Merrill College and College V. The Stevenson program, "Culture and Society," has been through several revisions and this year the program was reduced to the fall quarter only. Merrill has developed a non-required core course and a number of courses on different parts of the underdeveloped world. Participation in the College V "Workshops" is required of freshmen for two of the three freshman quarters. In general, the core courses have been only a partially successful vehicle to provide an identity or integrating force in the development of the colleges. Crown College abandoned its core course after two years and now offers approximately fifty seminars based on the interests of its faculty members. Some of the seminars are interdisciplinary and are conducted by two or more faculty members from different disciplines. An artist and a psychologist offer a seminar called, "Art and the Perceptual Process." A philoso-

pher and a psychologist offer a seminar called, "Aggression." An economist and an anthropologist offer a seminar called, "Environmental Influences on Human Characteristics." An example of faculty conducting seminars on topics that bear on their interests and expertise outside their disciplines is one called, "Enology" and is offered by a psychologist and an astronomer. (Enology, for the uninitiated, is the science of wine and wine making. The University of California has played a major role in the improvement of the California wine industry.) Each college has a few of these non-disciplinary courses or seminars even if it has a core course. Currently under discussion is the possibility of the colleges assuming major responsibility for the entire lower division program.

From its beginning in 1965, Santa Cruz has encouraged new approaches to learning. One basic approach was to make all courses equal and to make three courses per quarter the normal load. This decision permitted students to concentrate more fully on fewer courses per quarter. For external transfer purposes only the course value is identified as five quarter units. Although the campus requires by this standard the same number of units for graduation as the other campuses, stating the requirement in terms of 36 courses for the baccalaureate deemphasizes the "necessary" adding up of bits and pieces of units.

The campus has also operated under a variance from the University grading system.³ Until this fall, all students, including graduates, have been graded Pass/Fail plus an evaluation. Beginning with the winter quarter 1972, only passing grades will be recorded. A grade of pass represents clearly satisfactory work toward the degree. Written evaluations by instructors vary from terse judgmental statements to lengthy, sometimes glowing prose. In addition to passing grades on all course work, each senior must write and pass a comprehensive examination in his major field(s) or he must submit a satisfactory thesis before graduation. The pass/no record grading frees students from the competitiveness and extrinsic motivation of letter grades and grade-point averages. The evaluation provides more, and hopefully, a better quality of feedback to the student and a more descriptive form of information to other schools. The comprehensive examination or thesis provides an overall measure of the student's breadth, depth, and mastery of his major field(s). An academic transcript for a Santa Cruz student consists of a complete set of course grades and evaluations, or if the student wishes, only the set of course grades.

Students at Santa Cruz are encouraged to undertake studies that are not included in the course offerings of either boards of studies or colleges. At the lower division level, students may engage in "directed studies" and at the upper division levels, they may engage in "independent studies." In each case,

the student has a faculty advisor or sponsor who assists in the design of the learning project. More than half of the students who have graduated from Santa Cruz have taken independent studies and almost 6% of all the course enrollments in the past two years have been independent studies enrollments.

Almost one hundred students out of 4,084 undergraduates are presently pursuing **interdisciplinary major programs**. These are majors which fall outside a discipline and generally involve integrating material and experiences from two or more disciplines. Students propose the intended major in writing along with a justification and rationale for the program, the courses to be taken and whether a comprehensive examination or a thesis will be included. The student must find three faculty members, at least one of whom is from his own college, who will serve on a committee to supervise the program. A sample of the majors presently being supervised includes the following: "Myth and Consciousness," "Play in Culture," "Construction of Reality," "Creativity and Consciousness," "Literature and Nature," and "Art and Social Awareness."

Field Studies and extramural studies are offered in four of the five colleges and by twelve of the boards of studies. Both lower division and upper division students may engage in these programs which are conducted off-campus. In some cases, the program is designed and supervised by a board of studies to provide actual experience in an aspect of the discipline. Earth Sciences, for instance, provides the opportunity to do, "geologic mapping or topical investigation of specific geologic, paleontologic, or geophysical problems conducted in the field." On the other hand, field study programs may be another form of independent study for some students or they may be campus/community projects in which students participate. Merrill College has a large program of this nature. There are seven or more continuing projects such as working with the "California Rural Legal Assistance" program in two communities, the "Student's Alternative for Youth," a program with the Santa Cruz Probation Center, and the "Seaside Education Project" of tutoring and working as teacher aides. Students may also design their own field study project. A petition to participate in the Merrill Field Programs requires the student to have a faculty supervisor and to submit a detailed proposal for the project to the Field Committee for review and approval. The number of field study enrollments on the campus during the three quarters of 1969-70 exceeded 900, about 1% of the total course enrollments.

The title "**Apprentice Teacher**" is used to designate a junior or senior who has designed his own course and is teaching other undergraduates. The seminars are limited to twelve students and are supervised by a faculty member. The Apprentice Teacher receives credit for his work in the design and presentation of the course and the students who enroll in

the course receive credit as they would in any other course. The colleges report generally favorable results and no serious problems. Examples of the course titles are: "Plant Ecology of the UCSC Campus," "The Individual and Science," "History and Methods of Classical Horticulture," and "Expression and Structure Within the Christian Church."

The campus is well equipped and staffed in instructional media but these facilities and services have not been widely accepted at Santa Cruz to date. There is an overwhelming concern for humanizing the undergraduate's education and a fear that technology will undermine this goal. However, the campus does have extensive facilities for television and a whole range of instructional media. A thirty-page catalogue of non-book media resources for individual study has been prepared for faculty and students. Of considerable interest to students presently are the new audio-retrieval labs. One hundred points of access are already available in four locations on campus. A student merely dons an earphone/microphone unit and dials a program from a selected list of available programs. Current class lectures are available within 24 hours and are on the program for three days. For certain courses, a student would not have to attend classes at all but could listen to the lectures at his convenience. Televised lectures are available in the student's own room and many rooms are presently wired for eventual AM/FM radio signals and computer access.

Study is not restricted to credit-type programs. A considerable amount of informal, non-credit study is undertaken as an outgrowth of more formal programs or through an interest in specific projects and activities.

College V has developed a number of "Guilds" which complement the art workshops of the core course and which also serve as an alternate center for art education. The guilds are student-oriented and are motivated by standards of quality which are judged through public performance. Instruction is part of the program and each guild has a faculty member or community artist who serves as a resource. Last spring the Theater Guild presented an excellent staging of "Look Back in Anger" with the class in electronic music providing an introduction, the Jazz Guild providing riffs throughout the production, and a member of the Theater Guild providing a photographic display of the production outside the theater. The Harpsichord Guild has undertaken the construction of a harpsichord. The Lux Nova Choir specializes in Renaissance and pre-Renaissance music and performs for a variety of campus and off-campus functions. There were about a dozen guilds active last year. They are chartered annually and their measure of success is the quality of their public performances.

Physical Education is not required of students at Santa Cruz and there is no "big time," major sports program, yet enrollment in courses and activities is high. Programs are based on

student interest, and students are obviously interested. The physical education staff prepared a survey questionnaire and asked students to rank-order the programs they wanted on campus. More than two-thirds of the questionnaires were returned and the staff revised, dropped, or added programs in keeping with the survey. Student participation doubled over the previous year. Emphasis is on instruction and only the best teachers are employed but there are also intermural activities, sports clubs, and life-time sports available.

Since its beginning, Santa Cruz has fostered a **Garden Project** which is based on a love of the earth and on organic gardening. Four acres are intensively cultivated for flowers and vegetables. Student interest in the project has been high and the current national interest in ecology and the environment has given it new status. Considered by most in the early stages to be unrelated to the academic programs of the campus, the project is now an important aspect of the environmental studies program. The activities of the garden project and academic studies are being bridged by a course for credit which is sponsored by the Environmental Studies Committee and by the development of an intern program through University Extension. Last spring the Campus Planning Committee approved a proposal by the Garden Project and supported by the Environmental Studies Committee to develop a twenty acre "home farm." This new project is now underway and will include the growth of fruit trees and other crops which are not possible in the present program.

Continuing innovation is encouraged and supported at Santa Cruz through several programs. Faculty members may submit proposals for funding by the University of California's Innovative Projects in University Instruction program. The proposals are reviewed by a University-wide committee representing all nine campuses. Each year Santa Cruz has had several innovative projects supported from this source. Projects are often based on the use of new equipment or new approaches to replace traditional methods. Other projects involve the development of specific programs to meet the needs of specific constituencies such as disadvantaged students or ethnic minorities.

A second program called Regents Undergraduate Instruction Improvement Grants was introduced in 1971-72. This program is aimed at bringing about long-term improvements in undergraduate instruction and will be managed by the individual campuses on a matching basis.

New and major innovations in college programs may be experienced over the next three years through a substantial Ford Venture Grant that the campus has received. The emphasis will be on the new colleges, some of which are not yet in existence, but the new ideas and programs that are generated will have an impact on those colleges already in opera-

tion. While the early colleges have been infused with innovative ideas, this is the first time that the campus has had a major grant to support the pursuit of innovations within the colleges.

4. Evaluation of Student Experiences:

Pass/no record plus evaluation grading has already been described, but it should be noted that each student has access to his evaluations through his college office. Students often discuss their evaluations with faculty members.

To date, no standardized objective testing instruments have been used at Santa Cruz, but there is some interest in adopting the Graduate Record Examination for use with graduating seniors as a means of evaluating overall achievement and readiness for graduate work. Small group approaches to evaluate student life and experiences have not been used in the early colleges but Kresge College has developed "kin groups" and certain aspects of subjective evaluation will inevitably be included. The "kin groups" include 20-25 students with a faculty member. Each "kin group" develops its own social or work program in keeping with the needs and interests of its members. Considerable emphasis is placed on "sensitivity training" concepts in some of the groups and subjective context is thereby legitimized. This is the first quarter for such groups in Kresge so the results are yet to be reviewed.

Writing is the major vehicle for examining student achievement. As mentioned earlier, about 75% of all courses offered require some form of written document as the end product. The comprehensive examination required for each major is usually oral, however, and takes place with three faculty members. Very few students choose the thesis as an alternative to the comprehensive examination. The written and verbal emphasis at Santa Cruz is known to students seeking admission and the Admissions Committee, consciously or otherwise, selects students high on this dimension.

Evaluation of out-of-class learning opportunities such as field work, community studies, and independent studies is usually determined jointly by the student and his faculty supervisor. Papers and journals provide a record of the basic learnings of the student and extended discussions with the faculty supervisor raise questions and further explore the outcomes of the experience.

5. Development of Faculty and Evaluation of their Work:

There are no organized approaches to faculty development nor is there pressure to adopt new teaching styles. Most faculty were attracted to Santa Cruz because of their commitment to undergraduate teaching and most have pursued an informal, student-oriented approach to instruction. Perhaps the most significant change that faculty members undergo at Santa Cruz is the exposure to interdisciplinary teaching and learning. Faculty members are not isolated within their dis-

cipline as they would be in a typical department. Instead, they have offices more or less randomly assigned in the colleges and an anthropologist could be located beside a philosopher. (Few scientists have college offices.) Moreover, the core courses and seminars in the colleges are primarily interdisciplinary efforts requiring exploration of and participation in another field. It is not uncommon to find an anthropologist and a literature professor examining the same period of ancient Greek civilization and learning from one another so that both disciplines may be brought to bear on the subject for the next "World Civilization" class.

Individual faculty members spend considerable time developing instructional approaches to their courses. Faculty members are constantly in one another's classes as guests or as participants. Some faculty members have sought out the services of the campus media specialist, adult educators, or group dynamics experts to discuss new instructional ideas, to get feedback on their own performance, or to understand better what was going on in the class that aided or impeded learning.

The criteria used in evaluating faculty members for appointment, merits, and promotions to tenure are common to all campuses of the University of California. Specifically, these criteria are: teaching, research, University service, and community service. Santa Cruz has a somewhat more complex and collaborative process for making these decisions due to the collegiate structure than do other campuses, however. The steps involved in promotion to tenure are illustrative:

1. The Board of Studies reviews the candidate's scholarly record in the discipline and prepares a recommendation which includes: teaching performance, publications and research in progress, service on committees, and involvement in or service to the broader community.
2. The college reviews the candidate's record, including the recommendation of the Board of Studies, but adds consideration of teaching and service within the college to its own recommendation.
3. The Divisional Vice Chancellor reviews both recommendations as well as any additional evidence deemed appropriate and writes a summary recommendation.
4. The entire dossier is forwarded to the Budget Committee of the Academic Senate through the Chancellor.
5. The Budget Committee recommends members for an "ad hoc" panel of experts to review the dossier. The Chancellor appoints the "ad hoc" panel.
6. The report of the "ad hoc" panel is reviewed by the Budget Committee which then submits its own recommendation to the Chancellor.
7. The Chancellor submits an abbreviated report on the candidate to the Regents of the University of California.

8. Unless objected to by the Regents, the Chancellor may approve the promotion and notify the individual.

There are appropriate procedures for handling disagreements at each of the various steps but the Chancellor, with the approval of the Regents, holds the final responsibility for appointments, merits and promotions. Appointments or promotions to non-tenure positions do not require an "ad hoc" panel or regental approval.

A new element in the review process is the presidential directive that each case being considered for merit or promotion must include appraisal by students of the candidate's teaching performance. During the past year many different approaches to the evaluation of teaching by students have been undertaken in the colleges and by the board of studies. Standardization will take place only if one extremely effective procedure is developed and agreed upon.

There is no specific rule governing the number of courses to be taught by a faculty member. The administration, however, expects faculty members to teach the equivalent of five courses during the three quarters of an academic year. Except for the natural sciences, most faculty members teach one or two of their courses for their colleges.

6. Concern for External Relations:

To date, Santa Cruz has generally been positively regarded by external agencies. The campus was accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges in 1965 on the basis of its academic plan and was positively reviewed by WASC in 1970. The only noticeable problem has been the interpretation of the grading system for graduate schools. Most often the problem is handled by providing a description of the grading process and ample faculty course evaluations.

There are two few alumni to present either a negative or a positive force as yet and there are no special problems with the state or federal government, foundations or the legislature with regard to the nature of the campus and its programs.

The City of Santa Cruz is both politically conservative and a large retirement community. Although the University was avidly welcomed in the community, the liberal nature of the faculty and students—not to mention the dress and freedom of the students—has caused older residents considerable concern. The recent awareness of environmental problems has pitted student groups against certain local industries and the community has responded in kind by projecting what a campus of 27,500 students would do to its environment.

The eight counties surrounding Santa Cruz are predominantly rural and attract many migrant farm workers and their families. Many of the farm workers are Mexican-Americans and some school districts have up to 50% Mexican-American or Spanish-speaking students. A high priority for the campus has been the development of a teacher education program

aimed at meeting the needs for bi-lingual, bi-cultural teachers. Another priority is the recruiting of Mexican-American high school graduates from these counties for admission to the campus either as regular admits or as special action admits.

"Career risks" are not too great for students who choose Santa Cruz. The campus is quite explicit about what it can and cannot offer students, and the students make their decisions in the light of their own needs and goals. The grading system may indeed pose a risk for some students and when this has appeared unavoidable, minor adjustments have been made. (For instance, if letter grades are demanded for mathematics courses for admission to a particular graduate school, letter grades may be assigned by the faculty member for those courses only.) Generally, the campus position has been that the problem lies with the graduate school and only if a student is definitely discriminated against because of the grading system will it accede to letter grades.

"Career risks" are somewhat greater for faculty members. The high emphasis on undergraduate teaching tends to mute or undermine the research activity of faculty members. There is, perhaps, a point beyond which a faculty member would lose some attractiveness for "publish or perish" departments in other institutions. On the other hand, with the growing number of "experimental colleges" or "cluster colleges," greater opportunity for transfers and promotions is arising.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Academic Plan: University of California, Santa Cruz, 1970-80.*

² F. M. Glenn Willson. Analysis of Course Work Taken by Stevenson College Graduates, 1969-70. Mimeographed report.

³ A more complete description of the grading system may be found in: *Report on Grading at the University of California, Santa Cruz*. Committee on Educational Policy, Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate. January 26, 1970.

The Purpose of Antioch

James Dixon, President

Antioch intends to be an international network of learning centers at the post-secondary level. It seeks to serve students of diverse ethnic and racial origins, or the entire range of income backgrounds, of varied academic aptitudes and prior preparation (including the ablest on diverse measures and also those called "high risk" on some measures), of a wide range of age, and with varying but active social and political and philosophical concerns. With respect to these students, its purpose is to evoke a high degree of learning and growth compatible with their own increasing self-determination and their own aspirations. With regard to their cultures and communities, Antioch seeks to show the respect due in a culturally pluralistic world in which culture as well as individuality are entitled to equality of expression and opportunity.

The needs and the means to these ends vary, but the purpose of enlargement among students of horizons and appreciations and of competence to cope and serve are common.

In its learning strategies, Antioch is marked by a commitment to the use of work experience and experience in resident roles in diverse communities as a key resource. Active interaction between first-hand experience and the world of books and ideas is sought as a pervasive strategy.

Antioch seeks to utilize the resources of diverse settings and communities and cultures as aids to learning. It intends thus, not to be a residential college concentrated in one place, but a geographically dispersed network drawing upon the unique resources of each setting to enrich the student's opportunities to learn.

Antioch seeks to bring together able faculty of diverse qualifications with its diverse students. The college works from the hypothesis that the interaction of well qualified but differently qualified people among both students and staff is a primary source of its measured impact.

Antioch seeks to be an innovator in higher education and a stimulus to innovation in other educational institutions.

Antioch aims to foster autonomy of the individual. It seeks to do so by according to students an unusual degree of autonomy in student living, college governance, and academic planning and educational programs. The encouragement of student initiative in defining educational objectives and methods

is viewed as a factor in enlarging the growth and learning possible through the college's activities.

Antioch has recently been characterized by an increasing engagement of students and faculty in efforts to achieve desirable social change. The college encourages committed activity rooted in the processes and findings of inquiry.

Antioch does not aspire to growth in size for its own sake. It aims to be capable of growth or contraction as practical considerations conduce to the need for these changes and as the demand for its services fluctuates.

The purpose of the college is acknowledged to exceed its grasp of means, yet it is not intended to be so far out of reach as to fail in guiding the direction of the college's efforts. As understanding and resources grow, the purpose is expected to change.

The present campuses and their associated field centers are:

Yellow Springs Campus, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

Antioch Education Abroad, Yellow Springs, includes centers at Besancon, Tubingen, Bogota, London

Philadelphia Urban Education Center, 254 South 15 Street, Philadelphia

San Francisco Center, 149 9th Street, San Francisco, California

Antioch-Putney Graduate School, Columbia, Maryland 21043

Putney Center, Putney, Vermont, and Harrisville, New Hampshire

Washington Center, 1701 New Hampshire Ave., Washington, D. C.

Philadelphia Center, 45 Maplewood Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.

Yellow Springs Center, Antioch College, Yellow Springs
Colegio Jacinto Trevino, 237 S. Missouri, Mercedes, Texas
New York City Center—The Teachers, Inc., 2700 Broadway, N. Y., N. Y.

Juarez Lincoln Center, 6745A Calmont, Fort Worth, Texas

Washington-Baltimore Campus, 1709 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D. C.

Columbia Center, Wilde Lake Village Green, Columbia, Md.

Washington Center, 1716 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D. C.

Baltimore Center, 805 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Md.

Project MASS, 3100 Portland Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.

The Teachers, Inc. Paraprofessional Program, 2700 Broadway, N. Y., N. Y.

-
- Southern Appalachian Center, 320 9th St., Huntington, W. Va.
- Portland Learning Community, 215 S. E. Ninth Ave., Portland, Ore.
- The Harlem Hospital Physicians Associates Program, N. Y.
- The Teachers Inc. Day Care Center Project, 2700 Broadway, N. Y., N. Y.
- Colegio Jacinto Trevino (undergraduate program), 237 S. Missouri, Mercedes, Texas
- Antioch School of Law, 1145 9th St., N.W., Washington, D.C.**

University Without Walls

**Samuel Baskin, President
Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities**

An Experimental Degree Program in Undergraduate Education

The time is ripe for the development of fresh designs for college education—more relevant, more flexible in meeting individual needs, more economical, which serve more kinds of students, which utilize a broader range of educative resources, and which foster continuous life-long creative learning.

I. Summary

An alternative plan now exists for undergraduate work which can lead to a college degree. It is called a **University Without Walls** because it abandons the tradition of a sharply circumscribed campus and provides education for students wherever they may be—at work, in their homes, through internships, independent study and field experience, within areas of special social problems, at one or more colleges, and in travel and service abroad. It abandons the tradition of a fixed age group (18-22) and recognizes that persons as young as 16 and as old as 60 may benefit from its program. It abandons the traditional classroom as the principal instrument of instruction, as well as the prescribed curriculum, the grades and credit points which, however they are added or averaged, do not yield a satisfactory measure of education. It enlarges the faculty to include knowledgeable people from outside the academic world and makes use of various new techniques for storage, retrieval and communication of knowledge. It places strong emphasis on student self-direction in learning, while still maintaining close teaching-learning relationships between students, teachers, and others. It aims to produce not "finished" graduates but life-long learners. Moreover, the program is so organized that it promises in time to reduce the costs of higher education, without impairing (and we believe in fact increasing) quality and standards of student undergraduate educational programs.

II. Rationale and Need

The prevailing paradox in higher education today is a flood-tide of students eagerly seeking admission to college and in too many instances, their subsequent disillusionment, apathy, dissent, and protest.

Piecemeal reforms within the traditional structure of the American college have usually proven palliative but not redemptive. Here and there, now and then, for a short time, various colleges have introduced independent study, field experiences, travel abroad, computer-assisted instruction, telelectures, interdisciplinary courses and seminars, experiments with the admission of the previously inadmissible, more intensive orientation and guidance programs, along with a myriad of extra-curricular activities. None of these, and no combination of them, has as yet transformed the standard model of the undergraduate college, or eliminated student dissatisfaction.

Meanwhile, pressures are mounting. More students apply for entrance and numerous colleges now despair of any significant improvement in their instruction because they are trying to cope with thousands of students in facilities appropriate to hundreds. The new entrants are more diverse as well as more numerous. They differ from one another, and from preceding college generations, in their values, skills, and knowledge. No single prescribed curriculum, no set of optional "majors," is going to meet all these students where they are now, and nourish their continuous growth in curiosity, spontaneity, appreciation, understanding, competence, concern, and character.

Financial pressures have grown serious. The future of small private colleges has become precarious. State schools struggle with budget cuts imposed to keep taxes from soaring. If any more economical method of education can be devised which will lower costs while preserving standards of scholarship, it will eagerly be grasped.

Pressures are mounting also from the new needs of a changing society. Recent research continually outruns textbooks in most of the sciences. Technological advance has altered many of the old occupations and created new careers for which few colleges give good preparation. New viewpoints and ideas are arising, not only in science and technology, but also in the social sciences and in all the creative arts. Faculty and students alike have become only too aware that what has been or what is now being taught, is, in too many instances, rapidly becoming outdated.

Rapid advance within a sophisticated civilization produces not only problems beyond the traditional curriculum but also resources which have never been well used in higher education. In most cities there are specialists of high competence in fields which do not appear in the college catalog. New specialties emerge every month. There are banks of systematized knowledge which extend far beyond the college library. There are agencies of communication which link the world more efficiently than some campus switchboards link the department offices. There are not only unresolved conflicts and problems but also continuous experiments in coping with these, which

go far beyond the resources of any campus laboratory. There are interesting people working out their own lives in ways which transcend the stereotyped patterns of American child, adolescent and adult roles. In short, there is more going on that has educational significance away from the campus than can possibly be brought onto it.

Attempts at major innovations which have sought to develop radically new forms for undergraduate education, have inevitably encountered resistance from administrators, faculty, students and parents alike. For all of us, having experienced our own education in a particular mode, have become accustomed to think of the undergraduate education as having to occur in a certain "place" or building known as a college, where students and faculty meet together for a set number of weeks and over a set number of years, after which period one is awarded (or not awarded) the undergraduate degree.

It seems clear that if we really mean to address ourselves to the many problems that now beset our increasingly troubled colleges and universities, that it will no longer be sufficient to fit new pieces into the old framework. Bold new forms are needed, breaking the constraints which have fettered faculties and students and prevented creative adaption to both individual and social needs in this changing civilization.

III. Participating Institutions

The University Without Walls project was developed by the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities.¹ A total of twenty institutions will take part in the program to include member institutions of the Union, as well as non-Union colleges and universities. Institutions planning to take part in the program include the University of Minnesota, the University of Massachusetts, Antioch College, New College at Sarasota, Shaw University, the University of South Carolina, Roger Williams College, Bard College, Chicago State University, Goddard College, Howard University, Friends World College, Northeastern Illinois State University, Stephens College, Loretto Heights College, Staten Island Community College, Skidmore College, Morgan State College, New York University, and Westminster College. In addition, plans are presently being developed for the inclusion of several institutions from outside the USA in the University Without Walls program, and it is expected that at least three or four such institutions

¹ A consortium of 22 institutions that have joined together to foster research and experimentation in higher education. Member institutions are Antioch, Bard, Chicago State, Friends World, Goddard, Hofstra University, Loretto Heights, Morgan State, New College of The University of Alabama, New College at Sarasota, Northeastern Illinois State University, Roger Williams, Shaw University, Staten Island Community College, Stephens, University of Minnesota, University of the Pacific, University of South Carolina, University of Wisconsin at Green Bay, Westminster, Pitzer, and University of Massachusetts. Headquarters for the Union is at Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

will be added to the University Without Walls program within the next year or two.

Planning grants for development of the University Without Walls program have been obtained thus far from three principal sources: the United States Office of Education has provided funds totaling \$487,000 for the planning of the University Without Walls units; the Ford Foundation has provided planning grants totaling \$400,000; and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has made an initial grant of \$10,000 for development of an international component of the University Without Walls program.

IV. Instructional Design: Some Key Elements

The UWW programs will seek to meet the needs of a broad range of students. They will provide highly individualized and flexible approaches to learning, making use of a much wider array of resources for teaching and learning than is now recognized, and relying heavily on self-directed independent study. While each institution will plan and design its own UWW unit, each will build its program around the following ideas considered basic to the UWW model:

- a) Inclusion of students, faculty, and administrators in the design and development of each institution's UWW program.
- b) Use within each UWW unit of program components which provide for a broad array or "mix" of resources for teaching and learning, to include regular course work, research assistantships and internships, field experience, independent study, individual and group project activities, seminars-in-the-field, telelectures, video-tape playbacks, programmed learning and related media, travel in this country and abroad and other. An **Inventory of Learning Resources** will be compiled and serve as a key guide for students and advisors in the planning of program sequences.
- c) Employment of flexible time units so that a student may spend varying periods of time in a particular kind of program experience depending on the special interests and needs he brings to a situation at a particular time. There will be no fixed curriculum and no uniform time schedule for award of the degree. Programs will be individually tailored and worked out between the student and his teacher-advisor.
- d) Inclusion of a broad age range of persons (16 to 60 and older) so as to provide opportunity for persons of all ages to secure an undergraduate education and to make for a new mix of persons—young and old—in our programs of higher education.
- e) Use of an **Adjunct Faculty**, composed of government officials, business executives, persons from community agencies, scientists, artists, writers, and other persons

(many of whom may be alumni of the colleges), who make their living in other ways, but who enjoy teaching and who bring special kinds of expertise and experiences to the UWW program. An extensive **Seminar-in-the-Field** program designed to draw on skills and experience of this **Adjunct Faculty**, will be developed by each UWW institution.

- f) Employment of procedure designed to maintain continuing dialogue between students and faculty in both one-to-one and small group relationships. Procedures employed to achieve this include: student-advisor meetings at the beginning and throughout the student's program; on- and off-campus seminars; field visits by faculty and use of correspondence, tele-conferences, and video playbacks.
- g) Design of special seminars and related programs to aid students in the development of skills necessary for learning on one's own. Two such seminars are planned: one will focus on the development of verbal and informational skills (designing and conducting critical inquiries; using library and learning center resources; retrieving and organizing information, etc.) necessary for independent learning; a second will focus on student attitudes and feelings about learning roles and the development of behavior skills that build confidence in one's own capacity for self-directed learning. Similarly, special training and workshop programs will be developed to prepare faculty for the new instructional procedures to be used under the UWW plan.
- h) Opportunity to participate in the programs and make use of the resources of other UWW institutions, once these programs have been developed.
- i) Concern for cognitive and affective learning, with periodic evaluation by students and their advisors. Each student is expected to produce, before applying for his degree a **Major Contribution**. This may be a research study, a work of art, a community service, a publishable article or book or some other noteworthy and valuable contribution. Length of time required for award of the degree will vary depending on the experiences a person brings to the UWW program and the time he needs to meet criteria (to be developed by each UWW institution) set for award of the degree. Special attention will be given (UWW central staff and participating institutions) to the development of new evaluation and assessment procedures, so as to provide more adequate criteria for determining individual readiness and time required for award of degree.
- j) Participation in a major program of research intended to compare the achievement of graduates of the UWW

programs with those graduating from regular programs. Comparison will include measures of both cognitive and affective learning.

V. Award of Degree

The **University Without Walls** is planned as a degree program, although some persons may wish to take part as non-degree students. The degree will be awarded by the sponsoring institution or by the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities in cooperation with the sponsoring institution.

State University of New York, College at Old Westbury

John Maguire, President

I. and II. Purpose and Outcomes

The key to the new academic program at the College at Old Westbury is the clientele it seeks to serve. The major aspect of the College's program is education for those historically bypassed by higher education. We believe that a new kind of curriculum is required for this new clientele which is, comparatively speaking, older, poorer, from cultures of "color," and a variety of ethnic and social-class backgrounds. The program must be developmental in nature, meeting this diverse clientele where they are and moving with them rapidly to levels of performance commonly associated with quality college performance. Our purpose is thus to assist such a group in entering the existing and emerging professions that most influence the self-determination of peoples. The formal mandate for the new Old Westbury is the inventing and refining of effective forms of teaching for the kind of student body that will enter public universities as they proceed toward "universal access to higher education." The College is pursuing as guidelines a student-faculty-staff composition up to 30% Puerto Rican or Spanish-dominant, 30% black, 40% from the variety of other backgrounds.

The second commitment is to serve the greater Long Island area as a significant regional college. We seek to establish a life-time educational relationship between our graduates and our academic resources. Program development at the College is therefore greatly influenced by a continuous appraisal of the major educational needs on Long Island.

Since a substantial number of our students come from economically handicapped backgrounds, we are committed to developing, with others, atypical methods for financing genuinely equal opportunities among our students, achieving new and flexible forms for student financial aid as one of our major concerns. The present projections for the growth in student enrollment at the College of Old Westbury are as follows:

	FTE	Headcount
1971-72	530	569
1972-73	700	875
1975-76	2000	2500
1980-81	5000	6000

The kind of student body coming to Old Westbury necessarily commits us to a redefinition of the liberal arts. On the most basic level, it is not just "relevancy" that our students are demanding, but education for survival and for a demonstrable improvement in the quality of their personal and community life. There is a tension at the College, among students and staff, between experimentation and innovation on the one hand and career training and preparing job advancement on the other. We have tried to keep this tension creative and to build it in to our programs, keeping us faithful to our basic commitment and giving us a real-life context for educational change. The results so far have clearly been more experimentation in the content of our curriculum than in the process of teaching.

Our curriculum places great emphasis on the interrelatedness of knowledge and of social problems. Each of the three degree programs is interdisciplinary: American Studies; Politics, Economics, and Society; and Comparative History, Culture, and Ideas. The core of study in each of these and an all-College requirement is the analysis of institutions in American society. Thus, there is admittedly a strong social science orientation to our curriculum. Institutions of science are examined at the same time that hard sciences are taught, and the sociology and politics of the arts and humanities are analyzed. Even while the arts are performed, the value and aesthetics of the humanities are discussed.

A further conclusion we have drawn from our student clientele is that we will cap liberal studies with professional training rather than with graduate (i.e., doctoral) programs in the liberal arts and sciences. A basic focus of the College's mandate for curricular innovation is to expedite career preparation by the restructuring of general and professional studies into briefer, more intensive time frames. Initially, the College is offering a pre-professional program in the Health Sciences and will have a Careers in Education program ready for 1972-73.

While the final long range academic plan for the College has not yet been formally adopted, the administration of the College is pursuing a plan for organizing the College so that, in addition to the present experimental undergraduate college of liberal studies, there will thus be a series of Schools, each of which utilizes the entire repertoire of demonstrably effective teaching techniques. Each of them would combine undergraduate education with professional preparation. Some of the possible schools and programs that have already been identified as needed in the greater Long Island area and long overdue for our particular student clientele are:

1. A School of Law and Public Administration.
2. A School of Communications (including journalism,

- film-video, the full variety of print-culture media, theatre arts, educational technology).
3. A School of Banking and Finance.
 4. A School for "Culture-Sustaining Professions" (library science, the economics and management of the arts, curatorship, etc.).
 5. A School of Architecture and Community Planning.
 6. A programmatic concentration in the non-clinical health services professions, associated with the Stony Brook Allied Health Sciences Center.

Our present feeling is that constituent colleges or schools within the College of Old Westbury should vary according to the nature of the educational task being performed, but that none should probably grow beyond 1200 students and a faculty of up to 100. That is the projected size of this first undergraduate college within the College.

III. Instructional Approaches

Our assumption is that people make important life decisions based on genuine intellectual activity, no matter how disconnected or disorganized. A major purpose of formal study is to forge conscious connections between this activity and disciplined studies in the College. As a result, we have emphasized orientation, gateway courses to the college as a whole and to individual degree programs, and basic skills teaching—all those areas where a student during his college years unifies the work of the mind with his own life in a special effort to avoid three or four years of either hustling or frustration.

After our first year's experience, we will probably continue to schedule periodic days of "extended orientation" or assessment throughout the student's first year. Similarly, we have allowed students to apply (no sooner than their second semester at the College) for life experience credit, encouraging them to evaluate those aspects of their life outside the College that are applicable to the requirements and programs of the College. Also, field study at Old Westbury, though a requirement, is not viewed as primarily a chance to experience the wider world—most of our students have already done that—but as a natural outgrowth of work started in on-campus courses. And finally, at the end of a student's work, there is placement for many through our professional programs in jobs directly related to local community needs.

We thus hope to relate College work intimately to life in the community by special attention to an expanded orientation at the start, close links to community work through field study and life experience credit during a student's time at the College, and by preparation for jobs that will allow students to meet personal and community needs. The College is committed to developing multiple entry and exit points that take into account the complex and often difficult lives of our stu-

dents. Community people will be involved for short terms of service to the College as field study or student-teacher supervisors, program resources, guest speakers. All of these features are meant to support the earlier stated basic assumption that a college education is not the block of time a student spends on campus, but a continuum of learning that starts before a student comes to school and proceeds through his later life. Work at college simply gives clarity and meaning to this learning experience.

IV. Student Evaluation

The evaluation of a student's work at the College is much more inclusive than course grades alone. Our minimum effort is to avoid a mere accumulation of credit hours for graduation. Instead, we have set up a number of qualitative measurements by which students can progress towards a degree.

Since most of our students come to Old Westbury with some previous academic experience, evaluation begins with our acceptance of transfer credit and its application to our own program. Thereafter, in recognition of a student body whose average age is in the late twenties, we evaluate life experience to the extent that it can be shown applicable to the academic objectives of various elements of the curriculum. We are estimating that about half of our students will spend no more than two years at the College so that these forms of evaluation are as important as the evaluation of work actually done while at the College.

Our grading system includes the grades of Credit and No Credit. In addition, the instructor is required to fill out a grid questionnaire with the cooperation of the student.

Criteria for Evaluation	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Performance of Class Assignments	—	—	—
Participation of Class Discussions or Projects	—	—	—
Demonstration of Proficiency in Areas Basic to Field	—	—	—
Comprehension of Course Concepts	—	—	—

The various program areas are to determine what kinds of proficiency basic to their programs should be demonstrated and are to fill in that criteria accordingly. Since this grid allows for an accumulative record of a student's work that can be computerized we believe it will satisfy the needs of employers and graduate schools for cumulative and extended measures of clear and effective evaluation.

V. Faculty

We have purposely avoided organization of faculty into departments, making all appointments to the general faculty and keeping appointments and promotions centralized in an Appointments Committee. Although faculty have a home base in one of the curricular program areas, they teach in at least two programs and, in addition, are likely to be involved in at least one team-taught course. In this way, faculty see each other in a variety of settings under natural conditions, making colleague evaluation more informed.

Each faculty and staff member of Old Westbury has made a contractual agreement to an annual evaluation. We will go through the first series of these evaluations this spring, but planning now indicates that the process will probably involve several stages: student evaluation of courses, collegial evaluation of teaching and programmatic evaluation that will carry with them important implications for the effectiveness of an individual in terms of building program areas.

Salaries are set at the time faculty are hired in open meetings of the Appointments Committee according to criteria of age and experience, previous salary, need, and expected contribution to the academic program. We have carefully avoided the "star" system, by which faculty are hired at salaries far beyond those of others with their experience because of special honors, minority group status, or other distinctions. Rank and tenure have followed almost automatically from salary levels. In our effort to emphasize tenure as a guarantee of academic freedom, not of job security, we have obviously counted heavily on the effectiveness of our annual evaluation. Now that professional staff in the State University of New York are represented by a union, salary increases are negotiated at the state level.

Because of over-enrollment of students and under-staffing due to the State budget freeze, we have found it very difficult to free key faculty for the development of new programs and for the kind of tutoring in basic study skills that our students require. The teaching and assessment of our initial program and the planning of new programs requires a student-faculty ratio at least a third lower than that at already developed institutions. No other factor will more rapidly turn a struggling new, experimental college from innovation to tradition than an over-burdened faculty that finds the pressures for accepting customary structures too hard to resist when it is coping daily with a heavy teaching load.

VI. External Relations

We have been constrained to develop a dual system of reckoning credit hours, course weights, and the like so that we can readily translate from our own in-house qualitative measures into units used by certification agencies, graduate schools,

etc. Generally speaking, courses entailing three contact hours each week are granted four credit-hours in conventional standards. Our experimental mandate has resulted in official recognition of proficiency examinations—rather than the sheer accumulation of course credits—as a means of fulfilling degree requirements.

Being a regular campus unit of the SUNY system automatically entails standard budget preparation and justification, standard auditing and financial bookkeeping procedures and a standard set of steps in program review and acceptance within the University and between it and the State Department of Education, required of all SUNY units. Beyond that, all professional and preprofessional programs entailing certification require additional approval by appropriate professional bodies as well as the University and the Department of Education.

As indicated earlier, our new students have concrete career expectations. They accept and welcome innovative pedagogic techniques so long as they can be assured that these will result in increasing the likelihood of their achieving their career goals. While our faculty generally tend to be "content radical and pedagogic conservatives," the students are willing to be process and pedagogic experimenters in the service of conventional career aims. While there are undeniable "career risks" for faculty and staff, the majority feel themselves to be in the vanguard of a future wave developing curriculum and methods that will be increasingly required in the years ahead; hence, pioneers and not martyrs.

We have been able to postpone excessive concern with mechanisms for exporting our innovations until they are proven and refined.

Several special features about Old Westbury and "the wider world" should be noted:

1. Because of the widely publicized initial experiment, deemed by most observers a failure, the new Old Westbury has to conduct its new experiment in a fishbowl. Journalists, students of education with various degrees of seriousness, researchers, etc., seek to study our development with enormous detail. We sometimes wonder if more spectators might not be watching Old Westbury than any other school in our region. This places special demands on us for a kind of cool and discipline that are hard always to achieve.

2. The College experiences some tension between its state and national mission and its commitment to serve its immediate region. The educational effort entails a student body whose racial and ethnic composition starkly differs in proportion from the predominantly white middle class region in which the school is set. Indeed, developing a school for the poor on what was formerly one of the wealthiest estates in all America symbolizes this tension. It has proven important for us to

recruit our racial, ethnic and economic minorities from the citizenry of the immediate region where we are.

3. Considerable debate continues about the meaning of being a "community-oriented college." In determining the meaning of "community," we commonly identify at least four elements: geographical proximity (the community as those around us), color (the community of those who share the same skin color), ideology (the community of those who share a common outlook or common concern), culture (the community of those who share a common heritage). All four elements are present in views of "community" at Old Westbury and a clear ordering of these elements is a matter toward which we are, through deep debate, proceeding.

4. Old Westbury is the only other public four-year college in one of the country's most densely populated areas. Hence, we are under steady pressure to fashion a college solely in response to identified educational needs of Long Island; for example, to develop a major school of business administration since none exists in the public sector in our region, and to develop third and fourth year programs for local community college graduates extending studies which they began elsewhere. The tension is between the development emerging from the internal logic of a consistent view or a piecemeal development dictated totally by externally set needs conceived in very conventional terms.

5. We have yet to see whether the traditional phenomenon of retrenchment in boldness of spirit and program development that accompanies financial recession will result in pressures from the Central Administration to curtail personnel and abandon innovation in favor of more conventional projects.

Bensalem: An Analysis

**Kenneth D. Freeman, Dean
Fairhaven College, Western Washington State University**

In many ways Bensalem has been the fantasy land of academe. The tiny college attempted a significant re-ordering of the power structure of the University. Professors and students have all, in an idle moment, wondered what would happen if the faculty or the university hierarchy had no significant political power over the student. What if there were no grades: no requirements? And what if the students controlled the governance of the institution? By design and, more perhaps, by historical accident Bensalem has taken these questions seriously and evolved as a college with no requirements beyond a vague three-year connection with the bursar. There are no grades or academic checkpoints and even contact with a faculty advisor may be only *pro forma*. A student may at the end of three years turn in a statement saying only that he has been enrolled for three years and he will receive the B.A. from Fordham University. Not only has the student been given complete academic freedom, but also the government of the college is almost entirely in student hands. Decisions concerning hiring, firing, allocation of funds, etc., are all made on a community basis in which the faculty have a vote, but only one vote per person. Thus the power bases of the college, traditionally concentrated within the faculty, has been shifted to the students.

Such a shift is a great threat to traditional faculty members. Wherever I have talked to Bensalem at regular colleges the response from the faculty reveals that the threat is both real and felt. It is clear that more is involved in Bensalem than an experiment with academic freedom. The nature of the university is being questioned. It is certainly not surprising that beginning in the spring of 1971, when Fordham began to consider changes for Bensalem, the primary theme of these changes was a re-assertion of the usual power of the faculty over the students. These changes within Bensalem are not complete, but as I write this in the summer of 1971, it is clear that what I say applies to the past only. A college called Bensalem may continue to exist at Fordham University, but it will be a very

*"Ben Salem an analysis by Kenneth Freeman from Hourglass: Personal Notes About Five Experimental Colleges edited by Gary B. MacDonald. Copyright 1972 by Gary B. MacDonald. By permission Harper & Row Publishers.

different place and most of the following comments will not apply. While my comments are in the present tense they might better be in the past.

I am glad to have been part of Bensalem. I consider it a significant moment in the development of American colleges and think it important that analyses of the college be attempted. Here I shall discuss self-government, the academic program, and the faculty. These three hardly exhaust the matter and to comment on them as separate from the totality is highly artificial. Yet the choice is not accidental, for these three focus most of the concern of the traditional university about Bensalem. This is fair, but the analysis distorts the reality of Bensalem for it tends to suppress the moments of joy, happiness and close sense of community and togetherness which occasionally happen. It is always this way: the negatives leap out at one whereas the positive items are more subtle. It is difficult to chronicle the growth of the human spirit. Thus the comments need to be read with sympathy and understanding. In seeking to break new paths Bensalem has made many mistakes and it is easy to come to the conclusion that the approach is just wrong-headed. I for one do not think it is. Having shared its life for two years I am convinced that a more humane and creative form of higher education lies in the general direction of Bensalem. This general affirmation must be heard, for if not, then the analyses which follows, mostly negative are distorted in meaning.

Bensalem is in the Bronx. It is in the middle of a drab tiny street closed at both ends; one block off Fordham Road, a main thoroughfare of the Bronx. It is surrounded by the university and Italian neighbors, and Bensalem has never been sure which of these elements is the more antagonistic to its program. The college is centered in a dilapidated apartment building dating from the turn of the century. The building is cut into twenty apartments which maximize privacy between apartments and minimize it within the apartment—just the reverse of what is needed. The one common room is small and a marvel of disorder. The special facilities of the college are limited to one small darkroom with sparse equipment. The maintenance level has been that customarily expected of slum landlords. There has not been much to bring the community together. There are no common eating facilities, no common classrooms, or seminar meeting places. We have only the apartments—some occupied by faculty and some by students. About the only factor that brings the community together is self-government and to that we now turn.

The question is, can a group of faculty members and students work together in a relationship of political equality (one person, one vote) to govern themselves in matters affecting the college? The experience at Bensalem does not make me hopeful as to a positive answer. Self-government is to me the least successful aspect of the experiment and accounts for much of

the hostility which unfortunately marks daily life at Bensalem. Self-government has degenerated to the point where opposing parties merely shout at each other and where there is no longer a forum for either meaningful communication or working together to find reasonable solutions to common problems. The fact that the college ended its current year with half its faculty unhired, and without a chief administrator is evidence enough that in addition to fostering hostility, the process is ineffective to the point of institutional suicide. Yet self-government is defended with ultimate seriousness at Bensalem. To a large extent this follows from the extended freedom which students enjoy. In the conventional college various groupings of students arise. However, since no group has any real power to determine the main course of the college, these groups have no reason to compete. At Bensalem the students have the political power to shape much of the structure and milieu of their college experience. This gives to the opinions of each group tremendous weight. It is frequently felt that if one group wins, then another group will be excluded from the college and vice-versa. This is a fairly accurate perception.

While no one can be expelled from Bensalem, students have control of admissions. Thus the dominant group can gradually extend their political base.

Self-government has been through three basic metamorphoses in the three years of the college's life. From the beginning there was the rhetoric of participatory democracy and of self-determination. However, the first ordering of the house had significant exceptions to the scope of this self-determination. For example, in the first year matters of budget and faculty hiring received only scant attention by the students and were largely decided by the director and faculty. For many reasons, tensions grew and led in the second year to a reorganization of the governance of the house. The college divided into two groups, one opting to rule themselves by consensus form of government and the other by majority rule. The division worked well enough until it became necessary for the whole house to make a decision together. Unfortunately, because the procedure for making a joint decision such as the hiring of a new faculty member had not been clarified it was insisted that when the house got together consensus be the procedure. Bensalem interpreted consensus as the Polish-veto system. That is, any one person who disagreed could block a decision. Along with this development, involvement of the entire community in decision-making grew. However, I was the only person hired using this system.

The second form of government broke down when the consensus group was unable to arrive at a consensus and in effect divided, leaving three groups in the house. Furthermore the community was at that point trying to decide upon a faculty member and while it was clear that there was overwhelming

support for a certain person, there was not 100 percent support. By a variety of moves the community moved to its third and present form of decision-making.

The present form of self-government centers in a weekly administrative meeting. There is an agenda posted for this meeting and it is attended by those interested. An attempt is made to decide matters by consensus. If it is impossible to arrive at a consensus, then anyone may move the matter to a house meeting usually held a week later. At the house meeting a 75 percent of those present carries. The matter is usually resolved at the house meeting although if as many as one-fourth of the house wishes, the question goes to a ballot vote of the entire house where it is resolved by 75 percent of those voting. With small numbers the 75 percent requirement means that a friendship group can usually block any proposal. As a rule it only takes eight votes to stop a proposal at Bensalem. Since almost any one has seven friends, we have not in a real sense moved far from the consensus method.

By setting the majority at 75 percent, Bensalem still endorses the utopian vision that there is common ground between people and that rationality and goodwill are sufficient to find that common ground. Little in Bensalem's experience indicates that this is the case. On the contrary, there is ample evidence that there are non-reconcilable differences within the college, and that these differences are not going to be solved by the method of discussion. Another obvious aspect of self-government at Bensalem is that it is a game largely without rules. In such a situation those with individual power and individual gifts of rhetoric and persuasion tend to rise to the top of the heap. Self-government becomes the law of the jungle in which control goes to the strong. The weak, or those who for any reason choose not to play in such a chaotic game, are manipulated and controlled by the few who in the best establishment fashion use power ruthlessly. From the standpoint of the few who have worked the Bensalem system to their advantage, it is a very successful system. Thus the power centers in the house are entrenched and determined not to allow any change in the modes of self-government.

The present form of self-government is the most conservative form of government which I can imagine. Its dynamics point to a continuation of the status quo. Practically any change is going to hurt someone, and those whom it may hurt would have enough friends to block the change. The result is no change. This means that there is little likelihood for Bensalem, left to itself, undergoing any fundamental alterations.

It is a mistake to construe self-government at Bensalem as a forum for discussion, or as anything analogous to the New England town meeting. Indeed our self-government has become much more theater than forum. For months no significant communication has taken place at a house meeting.

Rather, individual groups perform their carefully rehearsed plans for themselves and for each other. A minority of the college still holds to the thin hope that the meetings may be transformed such that people can come together in openness to work, to learn from each other, and to find reasonable and common solutions. Very regularly those of such opinions become discouraged, disillusioned and quit coming to house meetings, thus leaving the self-government process an open game for those who harbor no such aspirations.

Self-government at Bensalem consumes the time and energy of the community to a disproportionate degree. This is particularly true for the faculty. To a considerable extent the creative energy of the community is exhausted by the governmental processes and people are so taxed with the concerns of the process that they become nervous and drained. Further, the hostilities generated through the decision-making process carry over into all aspects of the college. It is rare to find a student working with a professor with whom he politically disagrees. Furthermore, this constant drain upon one's energies produces little result. It would perhaps be worth it if there were any evidence that seniors gain in political understanding. But, on the contrary, there is little indication that those who survive the process for three years are any more humane, any more given to working out compromises, even more kind and considerate in regard to individual differences than those who had first entered. On the contrary, it seems to be just the reverse. By the time people have been at Bensalem for an extended period of time any minor disagreement escalates to full scale ideological battle between the forces of good and the forces of evil. Any sense of perspective is lost and people are dominated by concerns which are genuinely trivial. It is convenient in discussing Bensalem with outsiders to stress that the political process is part of the education of Bensalem. Certainly this is the case, but it's an open question to what end the education points.

Corresponding to these characteristics of governance is a growing fantasy in the community with regard to the limits of its decision-making powers. Many of the students live in what is now a firm fantasy that they have power not only over Bensalem but indeed over all of Fordham and possibly even the universe. This belief is unshaken even by the knowledge, present at some level, that Bensalem does not hire faculty members but rather recommends individuals for Fordham to hire; that Bensalem does not set a budget but recommends one; that Bensalem does not have the power to fire or to renew a contract; that Bensalem does not own, maintain or have full authority over its building. The point here is a serious one. Bensalem in reality must function within a framework of given both from Fordham and its location. To the extent that this framework is not acknowledged by the participants in self-government process there comes to be an aura of unreality

about the entire transaction. For example, if Fordham does not accept a budget recommendation from Bensalem then there is, on the part of many students, a keen sense of offense and indeed of betrayal. Any attempt to remind the house of the external limitations is taken as a "fascist" trick, evidence of a "pig" mentality, or subservience to repressive authority.

A kind of anarchism pervades Bensalem's governance in that there is no definition of the college or any over-arching framework within which to argue a decision. If a student asks for funds for an activity, there is no statement of the college's purpose which would even allow a discussion as to whether or not the request is reasonable. There is not even any agreement as to what constitutes an educational request. In the absence of any such controlling definitions all matters tend to come down to personalities. Frequently it appears that if the individual proposing something has friends, he gets what he wishes, and if not, his request is ignored. We have neither history nor a constitution to give a sense of objective reality.

A major aspect of the self-government is faculty hiring. We have a method which makes almost no sense, for it requires the individual to be interviewed and ultimately approved by 75 percent of the community and results in merely a gigantic popularity contest. The process now resembles the election of a local sheriff; each group in the community tries to get a faculty member sympathetic to its interest. With this method it is impossible to agree upon areas of need or even upon the kind of person that one is looking for. Such criteria vary with individuals. The result is usually a stalemate, and it has been over a year since a faculty vacancy was filled, despite the fact that we are overwhelmed with candidates who wish to become faculty members. To be fair, the process worked in its first year to secure three new faculty members.

There is another problem here. Usually a faculty member can get hired at Bensalem only by becoming politically allied with one of the groups in the house. There then develops, usually before the faculty member arrives, an intense love affair between a group of students and this particular faculty member. The faculty member is championed by this group and is made to appear the salvation for all the ills of the college. He is supported at the house meetings with praise so extravagant that no committee of ten humans could possibly realize all these campaign promises. When the new faculty person arrives, it is quickly seen that he or she is after all only human and that he has definite limits to his time and energy and that he cannot supply the motivation and interest missing in the students. At best, the faculty person may be a resource person or model, but he will not solve the alienation, loneliness, and lack of direction so frequently found at Bensalem. This lack causes the sharpest and most bitter breakup which is particularly enervating to the teacher, and accounts to a large extent for the student's disillusionment with the faculty.

While I cannot outline an appropriate form of decision-making, it is nevertheless quite clear to me that the present form is a failure. In an attempt to make a radical break from traditional education, Bensalem has ended up time and again re-making the faults of the traditional system. This is particularly obvious with respect to self-government. The attempt was to be revolutionary and to create a more humane way of living together in solving mutual problems, yet the reality is that the community has constructed a system which is an exercise purely in power. It is a system where might is right, where intimidation is the standard, where character assassination and abusive rhetoric are common, where self-seeking is the order of the day and where human dignity frequently is non-existent. No political order in a "corrupt establishment organization" could be less humane, less loving or more illustrative of extreme individualism in the pursuit of self-interest.

I am convinced that self-government at Bensalem is not a prerequisite for the academic and social freedom which the place exhibits. The conclusion should be kept constantly in mind as basic for the following discussion of Bensalem's academic side. The word "academic" isn't quite correct; however, I do not know a better phrase for those activities traditionally honored and rewarded in the traditional colleges, the activities usually referred to as the curriculum. Bensalem is a self-conscious attempt to expand the meaning of this core of education as well as to re-value other aspects of human growth as equally important. Let me clarify by delineating the three main styles or philosophies of education found at Bensalem. I have overstated these philosophies, but I am sure that one could find "purist" adherents of each in the college. First there is the philosophy, held by a considerable group of faculty and students, that the goals of Bensalem are to be more or less those of a traditional college. This group sees Bensalem as simply an alternative means of realizing the same end. Without too much distortion this end can be labeled graduate school preparation. It tends to be oriented toward the traditional disciplines, even among those who are open to interdisciplinary work. The approach centers upon learning the methods and skills of the academic trade. Those holding this philosophy have no quarrel then with the usual goals of the university, but feel that the restrictions and the lockstep of the traditional university get in the way of learning, and they wish freedom to go about the task in the proper way.

A second philosophy finds the end of an undergraduate education much more in terms of the total person and sees the point of the college experience to be a maturing process in which one undergoes the transition from adolescent to adult. It is primarily an emotional change which may include cognitive elements. However, the cognitive elements are definitely subordinate to the emotional, moral, and spiritual aspects. This philosophy is prone to be expressed as "getting oneself to-

gether" or finding "where one's head is." Despite lip service paid to this ideal in the usual college catalog, this approach is an offense to much of the contemporary academy. It is, oddly enough, a harking back to the old denominational academies of the nineteenth century. It is, I think, also a direct reaction to the sterility of the contemporary discipline-oriented university.

The third philosophy of undergraduate education seen at Bensalem is difficult to describe without prejudice. This philosophy sees the college as primarily a haven or a sanctuary in which one may escape for a period of time from the absurdities of the contemporary world. Those endorsing such a philosophy know very well that they are in college purely because of societal and parental demands and that to them, the usual ways of interpreting college make no sense. The one function the college may serve is to be an umbrella between them and the world. Such an approach to education places the minimal demands upon the school, but one demand that is vigorously advanced is that the infringement of the college upon the student's individual life be minimal. It should be stressed that this philosophy is also regularly found in the traditional college.

In listing these three philosophies of education present at Bensalem, I wish to stress that I do not consider any of them in principle absurd. Given the exigencies of our contemporary society a solid philosophical case can be erected for any one of the three. I, by training and temperament, tend to go toward the first; nevertheless, I am keenly aware that it is to a large extent the end of education which is being attacked in our contemporary world, and that the university has upon itself the strong need to experiment not only with alternative means but with alternative ends to the undergraduate process. Even superficial reflection upon these alternatives will reveal that an openness to alternative ends of education will have far-reaching and often unexpected results.

With such divergent philosophies held by students and faculty, an evaluation of the academic program of the college is difficult, if not impossible. For example, one objective criterion might be the amount of time that students spend working with faculty. But notice that while this is perhaps a great virtue for those endorsing the second philosophical position (where the college is seen as a transition ritual and where there is a great need for emotional models), nevertheless for either the first or third philosophies (the college of academic preparation for graduate school or the college as a sanctuary) there is no particular need for much consultation with the professor. For the third position this is obvious, and we also know that given motivation and a good library one can learn without professors. (The above comments are in theory; in practice, it is the first group which uses the faculty.)

Thus the academic aspects at Bensalem are generally in

chaos, but it must be stressed again and again that this chaos is possibly Bensalem's real strength. On the other hand, such a state is a far cry from the usual experiment where one has preselected ends and then attempts to determine whether or not a given method will bring about these ends. The academic chaos precludes systematic analysis, but a few observations are in order.

One of the outstanding characteristics of Bensalem is that, compared to the regular colleges, it is a more honest approach. Students have described the experience as walking around with a mirror constantly before you. In a traditional college, the framework frequently allows one to fool himself into thinking that he is performing satisfactorily. Many students do no academic work until the night before the exam, and they either cram in enough to pass or visit the fraternity files. They work the system and get their C and yet they have accomplished very little, and what is worse they have never been brought up against their own lack of accomplishment. At Bensalem if the student is working and producing, it is obvious; and if he is not, there is no incentive to fool anyone into thinking that he is. It is my judgment that the actual amount of academic learning and work at Bensalem is not markedly different from the traditional college. However, the appearance is vastly different because those at Bensalem who are not engaged in learning are quite obviously not engaged. Parenthetically, this poses severe adjustment problems for Bensalem's professors. Although they should know better, college professors frequently deceive themselves into thinking that all their students are studying and learning. At Bensalem one confronts the students without his academic Sunday dress on, and the experience can be genuinely disquieting.

At a recent conference someone reported on a study which contended that in the traditional college roughly a third of the students were genuinely interested in learning and studying along lines traditionally defined, and the rest in varying degrees were working the system to get the B.A. This statistic proves to be roughly accurate for Bensalem. That is, it is my judgment that about one-third of the students have a serious desire to learn along traditional lines. For this third, Bensalem is clearly a very good place. It gives them the freedom to structure their lives in accord with their interests; it provides them with superb counseling and an emotional experience that I can conceive. Understandably, this group accounts for Bensalem's unusually high success rate in getting its graduates into prestigious graduate schools with handsome fellowships. It is for the other two-thirds of students that questions of an academic nature become difficult to answer. It is certainly arguable that three years of confronting themselves in Bensalem provides students with a greater educational and moral experience than four years of playing the system for what it's worth. Also, with regard to the retention of infor-

mation, it is not clear that Bensalem would be behind the regular college. Bensalem students learn much from their contact with each other and from the faculty. They tend to become interested in something and read extensively in that area. I certainly would not be surprised if testing were to reveal that Bensalem seniors scored as high on retention of information as students from a regular college, but would say that this is less a compliment to Bensalem than a critique of those who measure colleges by such standards.

In very concrete terms, one way to judge the academic program is by the number of students who work closely with faculty. It is my informal observation that of the 65 students officially connected with the college last year that approximately 16 worked very closely with a faculty member. That is, they were in regular detailed consultation with the professor concerning their work and studying with the professor in a variety of areas. At the other end of this particular spectrum, I would say that approximately 13 of our students had no significant contact with faculty members during the year. The rest of the students fall in between. However, it is probably the case that at least half the students have only minimal contact with the faculty. Furthermore, if one examines the students who are involved in group projects at Bensalem, the 17 who work closely with the professors account for almost all the students involved.

A comment about the students who work closely with the professors: it is not surprising that by and large these are the students who the professors best like. There has been a mutual selection process. Such a selection process, I feel, quite likely reflects negatively upon the faculty members selected for the experiment; a larger number should have come from non-academic backgrounds. Students in this group tend to be those normally associated with honors programs in the regular college. They are bright, articulate, highly individualistic, self-motivated and self-disciplined. Of the three philosophies of education discussed earlier they belong almost exclusively to those who see the college as an academic place. Yet they also share a characteristic in common with the rest of the students in the house. Bensalem is a highly individualistic place and among the academically oriented students the individualism and privatism which mark every aspect of Bensalem life are also present. It is difficult to get across that there is a corporate responsibility to the group in learning. They are far more like a typical professor who, if he is not interested in studying a subject will not study it, than they are like the typical student who occasionally will study things he does not find interesting either because someone else thinks he should or because of the demand of the study group. I find this individualism and lack of group responsibility distressing; nevertheless, I realize these students are only copying the professional models of American academe.

One of the problems of the Bensalem approach is that there is no definite and regular mechanism for encouraging or leading the student to expand his intellectual horizons. In the traditional college a move is made in this direction by means of requirements which force the student to sample a variety of intellectual disciplines. The freedom of Bensalem makes it possible for the student to continue only those interests he had upon finishing high school. Bensalem tends to be a way of moving the specialization of graduate school down onto the undergraduate level. In theory the individual student's work should lead him to explore a variety of intellectual involvements. Sometimes the theory works; as a rule it does not.

One glaring characteristic of Bensalem's academic program is its non-innovative non-experimental nature. The techniques used thus far between the students and faculty are among the oldest known in the academic world. Primarily it involves seminars and tutorials. Exciting and unusual ways of presenting the material are largely non-existent. The Lorillard Children's School stands as one possible exception to this statement. There the principle of learning by doing is practiced. While this certainly is not a new idea, it is nevertheless exciting and infrequently seen in the academic world. There are many reasons for the non-experimental nature of the learning process at Bensalem. In the first place, at Bensalem the initiative to learn falls upon the student, whereas many of the new and exciting techniques used elsewhere are aimed at supplying motivation in making the material more palatable for the student. Another reason is the lack of a predictable number of students in the group. It is not at all unusual for the group of 15 or so students at the start of a project to drop to three or four. Given the unpredictable make-up of the group, one frequently is unable to plan and realize many exciting possibilities. A third very important reason is that many expectations on a faculty member at Bensalem focus upon the general life and not upon the classroom. Thus a great deal of energy goes into the day by day living with students. Few professors have the time and energy left over to think of innovative teaching methods. These reasons are probably not sufficient, but they at least point to a real problem; that is, that experiment at Bensalem is totally with the structure of the college and not within it.

In short, Bensalem is a multiversity in miniature except that students' interests are allowed to run without any effort to channel them. As a result among the fifty-plus students one would find literally hundreds of interests. There is, consequently, no way for a small group of faculty to meet these interests and thus one usually finds a teacher overworked while dealing with only a small group of students, and yet correspondingly many students see the teacher as worthless simply because the professor's interests are not theirs and because he has so little time for them. In this kind of situation

the tutorial approach is clearly wrong-headed. No college today can afford the student-faculty ratio which allows a tutorial program to be effective.

The relationship between faculty and students tends to mirror patterns found in the traditional university. Students look for faculty members to support their pursuits. In so doing they are falling into precisely the same trap that has resulted in the departmentalization of the American college. What is needed is less attention to the specific interests of students and faculty members and more attention to finding faculty members who can listen well and critically and can facilitate the intellectual and emotional growth of the students, even across markedly different academic interests. Locating such faculty members is hard (and even if one locates them, getting them hired is next to impossible). By and large Bensalem has attempted to provide an experimental framework of education and yet continued to use faculty members trained and motivated in traditional ways. The combination is not particularly happy. Unfortunately, there is no place to turn in the academic community for appropriately trained people. One finds them by accident, if at all. Here again Bensalem mirrors the problems of the general academic community. Even those faculty members who have reacted strongly against contemporary university patterns are nevertheless so involved with it that they find it difficult to escape.

Supposedly at the heart of the Bensalem approach is the academic counseling program. In theory the faculty and students live together, and from these informal contacts come ample opportunities for discussion of all phases of a student's life. For those students who take advantage of these theoretical possibilities it is truly an exceptional opportunity to have a close working relationship with a variety of faculty members. Unfortunately most students do not take advantage of this aspect at Bensalem and certainly less than half of the students have any sustained counseling relationship with a faculty member. In one sense, it is a good thing; were all the students to enter into a close relationship with faculty members the faculty would be overworked to the point of exhaustion. It is probably only because most of the students do not choose such a relationship that the faculty has the time and energy to do a good job with those who do.

One other aspect of the academic program needs to be highlighted. There is a tendency in any of the experimental situations for the faculty to be slowly excluded. Bensalem's faculty has stayed longer and in closer contact with the experiment than might have been expected. Before coming to college the student normally has three or four different centers of authority over his life to which he must relate. There is the school, his parents, his peer group, and sometimes the church. Coming to Bensalem a student suddenly discovers that there is only one of the four to which he must relate, viz., his peer

group. It is perfectly possible to exclude the school in any of the usual senses. This gives the peer group an enormous power and makes it very nearly impossible to be a non-conformist in the Bensalem context. People quickly find the sub-group in which they are comfortable, and they rarely deviate from the opinions of that sub-group. Such an approach runs the grave danger of people staying essentially where they were when they came. It also not only runs the risk, but has the actual result, that people of different and conflicting opinions almost never have occasion for genuine exchange of views. In the traditional college, the classroom, for all of its ills, at least brings together a variety of people, in some sense randomly selected, to discuss a common concern. There is a potentiality, frequently realized, for different perspectives to influence each other. This rarely occurs in Bensalem. The cliques are entrenched and while they may shout at each other, they rarely talk with each other.

One may conclude than Bensalem is an opportunity for an extremely rich experience for those who take advantage of it. That many of the students choose not to avail themselves should be neither surprising nor upsetting. It is also a distinct criticism of Bensalem that it does so little work for those students not academically inclined. Any college can do well given students who are bookish and wish to study. The challenge in higher education today is to forge ways of working with the students outside the usual academic context. With the exception of one or two individual faculty members, Bensalem has done very little in this regard.

Much material concerning the faculty and their role and life has been already given in the discussion of the academic aspects of Bensalem. It is appropriate to focus now directly on the faculty. The pattern is rather consistent. We come full of enthusiasm, yet leave quickly and often with bitterness. In the three years of its existence the faculty turnover has been well over 100 percent. Such rapid turnover and disillusionment is a complex phenomenon, yet one well worth examining. The causes are many and difficult to locate, but certain aspects have become increasingly obvious.

One is the strain of sharing residence with students. The life-styles of most faculty members have subtle contrasts to that of contemporary college students. Putting the faculty member into an adolescent community poses problems. Though each one in itself is small, the total effect is troublesome. Examples might be the noise level, or the tendency of students to want to b.s. with you, or the frequency with which laundry soap is borrowed. Such small items mount up and begin to grate on the faculty nerves. It shows up first and most rapidly on those faculty members who are married. The effort to combine family life with the shared life of a living-learning environment is almost impossible. This is especially true where there are children.

A second problem is that students are frequently omnivorous with respect to faculty time. As an aggregate they will pick up as much time as the faculty member is willing to allow. Perhaps any one student would choose only to spend a half-hour a day with a given professor but there are perhaps 30 or 40 who, in a free situation, might choose to spend a half-hour with that professor. This is conjoined with pressures which the faculty members feel to be available to students and to have an open door policy. However, very quickly the realities of the situations make themselves felt, and faculty members find themselves cutting the students off, and through one means or the other making a private space in time for themselves. Students then often feel hurt and deserted which further adds to the problem. If he is not very careful the faculty member very quickly loses control of his day and among other things finds himself unable to study, which is essential if he is going to do more than simply work off the top of his head. The result for many faculty members is that in a living-learning environment they end up having actually less contact with a large group of students than they do in the regular college environment. The typical pattern within Bensalem is for the faculty member to come to know very deeply three or four students and then have only a casual relationship with the rest. One of the great surprises for me in coming to Bensalem was to discover that faculty members at a small regular college have more genuine contact with students than Bensalem's living-learning situation. I found that working in a small college I would frequently seek out the students. I would go to their dorms and their apartments; I would share coffee breaks with them, and I had an office which was quite regularly filled with students. In addition, I was teaching in a given semester 40 to 50 students in classes, which provided a base whereby I came to know students. Furthermore, it doesn't seem to me that the relationship between the faculty and the few students with whom he works closely is any deeper at Bensalem than in the small college. Contrasted with the impersonality of the large university the degree of interaction between the students and faculty at Bensalem is much greater. Contrasted, however, with a good liberal arts college it has nothing at all to brag about.

Thus the many virtues supposed to flow to the college as a result of faculty and students living together seem to me in the main not forthcoming. In theory the students and faculty learn from each other, observe each other's way of life and in general influence each other through natural and spontaneous interactions. In fact it does not work out this way. The faculty member is but an abstraction to most students and is dismissed by them. Most faculty members do not enter deeply into the student-peer groups. They are simply residents of the same apartment house.

A related problem here is that one of the needs which a

faculty member often feels is that of a platform, a place whereby one can present in an organized way the results of his learning. Bensalem, with its stress upon conversation, seldom affords this opportunity. The tutorial comes naturally to this form of education, for it appears a logical outgrowth of sharing a life together. Yet the method is a trap. It is simply the case that two or three eager students can take up the total working time of two or three faculty members. It is also the case that a faculty member, even at best, cannot adequately prepare more than five or six tutorials within the course of the week. Clearly a great many students are left out. The inability to realize the potentialities of the tutorial method, or the frustrations which come from trying to achieve them, is thus responsible for some of the faculty discontent.

Most faculty members come to Bensalem out of negative reactions to the established institutions and with high hopes and expectations of what Bensalem will afford. The reality of Bensalem is regularly a great shock and disappointment—one with which they frequently are not able to deal very successfully. Why this might be so leads to another aspect of the faculty problems.

From what has been said it is clear that faculty members often see themselves as over-worked, harried, and in general frustrated by their jobs, yet working with only a few students. I think it is less the case that they are over-worked than it is that they are in a situation which has relatively little psychological pay-off for them. Faculty members generally are bookish types who enjoy the life of the mind and who have been trained to expect a certain kind of psychic pay-off. Given a regular classroom (much like they had in graduate school) and even a small group of interested students, the papers, test results, analytic ability and a heightened level of argument quickly follow. These give the professor great satisfaction and transform his activity into pleasure rather than work. For faculty with these traits (often hidden even to themselves), Bensalem is a disaster. There are almost no conventional ways of getting these regular pay-offs. One lives a life primarily dictated by the students. He spends his time conversing about things students are interested in, engaged in political processes where the students have the power and often the wisdom, and in general conducting his life far more like a camp counselor than the traditional college professor. Unfortunately, he is not trained to get satisfaction for camp counselor activities.

The students demand, implicitly and explicitly, a mode of living more analogous to that of a pastor or priest than that of the traditional teacher. The demand is to become involved in a loving, supportive relationship with students. It is frequently more important that the professor be "one of the boys" on recreational trips than that he has some learning to impart. In indirect ways the students seek to see in the lives of the faculty members the embodiment of the ideals of the

experiment. It is something like a small town where the citizens forbid the pastor to smoke, but smoke themselves.

Another aspect of this problem is that being a faculty member at Bensalem calls for a fresh notion of leadership. The faculty member as the dispenser of information and knowledge has little place. Needed, rather, is the faculty member who is a good conversationalist and who can work in an informal relationship to facilitate the learning process. The temptation to over-lead is resisted with the result that often the faculty doesn't lead at all and leaves everything up to the students. In this situation, students are confronted with all the responsibilities of the choice. Often too keen a sense of the consequence results and the students opt for a non-threatening path. This is then a disappointment to the faculty member and he is tempted once more to become leader. The conflicts are many and intense and involve the total personality.

People with the needed skills for working within Bensalem are not being trained in the contemporary American graduate school, and if one locates a winner it is by grace, not by plan. Discipline is far less significant than the ability to listen. Overt skills are less important than the subtle ability to facilitate the growth of the student without making him dependent upon you. One needs people with skills, but it is vital that their personalities not be defined in terms of these skills. Furthermore it is almost impossible to escape the American graduate school without absorbing a keen sense of one's status and importance. The graduate is prone to feel himself the rightful heir to the tradition of faculty aristocracy. Such is altogether out of place within Bensalem, yet it is difficult to produce new types overnight. Again Bensalem tries to pour new wine into old wineskins.

Perhaps the faculty is not necessary to education and I'm certainly willing to entertain the hypothesis that for a certain kind of education a faculty in the traditional role is not needed. However, in our present world a faculty must be involved in the academic process if the school is to survive as a degree-granting college. Furthermore, I am convinced that Bensalem expresses tendencies increasingly to be seen in American colleges. To this extent these difficulties discussed above are not local in nature, but rather express a genuine and deep need for a different kind of faculty member. Methods of selection, training, recruitment and evaluating must be devised. Mere goodwill is insufficient.

In discussing three aspects of Bensalem, the focus has been upon the negative—upon the problems, upon pitfalls to be addressed and if possible avoided in moving in this direction. As I look over the words I am impressed at how different the reality is from my arid analysis of it. Where in these dire sentences would one find the reality of a student coming to Bensalem and coping with his freedom, solving a drug problem, and becoming a self-directed classic scholar sufficiently

good to be going to the University of Chicago on a Danforth Fellowship? Where is contained the story of a girl who has discovered and strengthened her many talents for self-expression as a disciplined actress? These realities and many like them are lost and my comments are the weaker thereby. My only defense is that I was not attempting a description of Bensalem, but rather an analysis of some of its features. My hope is that my comments will serve to further this style of education and not act as ammunition to those who knew all along that such a program would not work.

Ottawa University

Peter H. Armacost, President

Ottawa University is a relatively small college located in eastern Kansas. Since its founding in 1865, it has sought to be a Christian college of liberal arts. Within its geographic region Ottawa has enjoyed a reputation as a very good, if not widely known, college and it has maintained close ties with its alumni and church constituencies. Although its academic program throughout most of the century has been fairly traditional, Ottawa University has some long-standing experience with avant-garde programs; in 1942 the Ottawa faculty adopted a general education program which was quite distinctive at the time and this program was the key element of the Ottawa academic program until 1970.

Thus, the challenge in developing a truly innovative educational program at Ottawa University in recent years was quite different than the challenge faced by either the new universities or the experimental sub-colleges within larger universities represented at the conference. In a sense the challenge faced at Ottawa was how to achieve radical change in educational program on an institution-wide basis in a relatively short time span without wholesale changes in personnel and without loss of constituency support.

The initial impetus to change came with the appointment of a new president in 1967 who emphasized two points. First, most small colleges with relatively small endowments will face very great financial difficulties over the next decade. The exceptions to this rule will probably be those who respond with vision and courage to the problems which were highlighted during the late 1960's by the student unrest phenomenon. Second, proper attention to both aims and objectives and to learning principles in the process of educational planning will maximize the probability of developing an innovative educational program.

The planning process was designed to proceed, in sequence, through three stages: 1) To develop added clarity and precision in the statement of institutional aims and objectives, 2) To identify the opportunities for learning which must be provided to each student if the primary educational objectives are to be achieved, and 3) To design an educational program which provided the maximum possible number of the desired opportunities for learning. To a very substantial extent we were able to discipline ourselves not to discuss graduation requirements, general education programs, depth study provisions,

academic calendar and related matters until completion of the first two stages and this is of significance in the magnitude of change which resulted from the planning process.

Aims and Objectives

The discussion of aims and objectives resulted in three basic kinds of statements. The **Ultimate Aims** are the ultimate purposes for which Ottawa University exists; its basic "raison d'etre." (e.g. To contribute to the true good of human life and society.) The seven **University Program Objectives** are the basic institutional commitments deemed necessary to the achievement of the ultimate aims. (e.g. To provide a liberal education; to provide higher education in a Christian context; to value each student for his or her own unique qualities and to attempt to involve him or her in the total university community.) The **Primary Educational Objectives** are the goals which Ottawa University seeks to achieve in the personal development of each of its students. They are based upon the University Program Objectives and reflect, in particular, the goals for student development which result from a dual commitment to liberal education and to Christian higher education.

The twenty Primary Educational Objectives of Ottawa University are to assist each student:

- To acquire significant knowledge of the world of nature, the world of man, and the world of the spirit and the imagination and to develop awareness of and appreciation for his cultural, intellectual, and social heritage.
- To develop the habit of philosophical reflection upon the basic issues confronting mankind throughout history and in relation to the future.
- To learn how to learn what he needs to know and to desire to continue the process of self-education.
- To learn how to think critically and independently.
- To be able to express himself clearly and to defend his ideas with clarity and conviction.
- To become more open to new questions, new ideas, new alternatives, to continual exploration of the unknown and to those who hold divergent opinions from his own.
- To become a person of integrity whose faith, learning and behavior are related and interdependent and who has complete harmony between thought and action and between public and private behavior.
- To broaden his cultural perspective and to reduce his provincialism and prejudice.
- To develop an appreciation of beauty.
- To cultivate sensitivity toward the feelings and needs of others.
- To choose for himself, on the basis of his own reason, faith and experience after a confrontation with the

- Christian faith, an adequate hierarchy of values which recognizes the existence of a creative power beyond himself and evidence concern for others, for his society and for mankind in addition to concern for himself.
- To develop the capacity to identify and evaluate alternative viewpoints and actions and to choose among them on the basis of his value system.
- To be responsible in the use of his knowledge and skills and to act on the basis of reasoned convictions in response to the needs of society and of those around him.
- To demonstrate a belief in the inherent worth and dignity of all people.
- To identify those forces in the community and in the nation that support and give tone to ethical demands such as that for justice for all men while also respecting and upholding other strengths of democratic society such as the principle of order and the necessity for law.
- To look upon his life as an opportunity for service to God and man.
- To relate effectively and responsibly with other people in significant ways.
- To become aware of his own personal possibilities and limitations and to seek continually to develop his abilities and to realize his own creative potential in all areas of life while continually searching for deeper meaning in life.
- To find a focus for his intellectual interests and to find fulfillment in personal achievement in his vocation and in his personal growth.
- To be actively concerned about his physical well-being as well as his intellectual, moral and cultural well-being and to use leisure time in ways that cultivate physical health, intellectual stimulation, moral strength and cultural appreciation.

The planning committee sought to state the Primary Educational Objectives with sufficient clarity and precision to facilitate the next stage of program planning. Thus, in connection with each of the Primary Educational Objectives the planning committee asked, "What experiences or opportunities for learning must be part of our total educational program if the objective is to be achieved?"

For example, what experiences or opportunities for learning must be available if Ottawa University is to assist each student "to learn how to learn what he needs to know and to desire to continue the process of self education?" In response to this question, the planning committee agreed that the following experiences must somehow be provided as part of the educational program:

Opportunities to participate actively during college in

developing under faculty guidance a personal study experience with legitimate educational value.

Participation in a program of general studies which provides opportunity to master significant knowledge, related to the major divisions of human knowledge, and which is taught so as to focus attention on the persistent intellectual issues in the history of thought, on the ideas of fundamental importance which bridge the gap between various disciplines, on the knowledge of relevance to the major contemporary and future problems of mankind, and on developing the capacity to handle basic concepts and general principles while integrating and synthesizing knowledge.

Frequent experiences which require careful reading, the identification and formulation of problems and the means to their solution, written and oral presentations, critical discussion, working through the logic of verbal and mathematical propositions and the formulation and verification of hypotheses by means of the experimental method.

Opportunity to compare oneself with a clear statement of the model of adulthood and the standards of behavior which are valued in members of the Ottawa University Community and in its graduates.

Easy access to news media and stimulating books and magazines.

Experiences providing increasing opportunities for students to exercise responsibility, both individually, in pursuit of an education and in determining personal behavior, and collectively through meaningful participation in university decision-making concerning both educational and social matters.

Opportunities for close contact with faculty members who are themselves persons worthy of emulation, who are interested in students as developing persons and are willing to play a normative role, who combine expertise within their subject matter area with a desire and ability to teach undergraduate students, and who relate their life of scholarship to their life as citizens.

Clearly all of the above-mentioned opportunities for learning facilitate the achievement of other primary educational objectives as well. After a similar exercise with each of the primary educational objectives, the planning committee reached agreement on seventeen different kinds of opportunities for learning which must somehow be provided in the educational program of Ottawa University.

The third stage in program planning consisted of brainstorming alternative strategies for providing the greatest number of these necessary opportunities for learning in the optimal arrangement. After extended sessions of the planning com-

mittee, an all day discussion session involving the entire university community, and numerous faculty meetings and forums, the faculty adopted the new educational program by a secret ballot vote of 60-7.

The Program

The basic concept implicit in the educational program is education for personal development. The program is designed to shift more responsibility for the learning experience to the student and to shift the role of the faculty member from one focusing primarily on the transmission of knowledge to a role which involves clarifying issues, identifying sources of information, identifying alternative approaches and solutions to problems, and discussing the implications of knowledge.

1. **Learning Contracts**—The key to the Ottawa educational program is an individual contract between each student and the university which specifies the graduation requirements of that student. The University requires that each student demonstrate satisfactory completion of a general education experience, of a depth study experience, of a cross-cultural experience and satisfactory participation in the University Program Series (a variety of convocations, concerts and religious events during each session) and the physical activities program. The learning contract of each student specifies the precise method of satisfying these requirements. The number as well as the nature of the courses or learning experiences required for graduation may vary from student to student depending upon his or her background, abilities, interests and goals. In the context of this attempt to provide flexibility for each student, quality control concerns are addressed by the faculty Committee on Academic Review which reviews each learning contract and must approve it on behalf of the university.
2. **Advisory Committees**—Effective implementation of the individualized approach to curriculum and graduation requirements forces special attention to the advising process. Each student begins with a primary advisory who is also his or her core seminar tutor. Thus, they see one another daily during several academic sessions during the year. As the student's interests crystallize or shift, a second faculty member may be added to the advisory committee, at the option of the student, without breaking the continuity of relationships between the student and his initial advisor. A student may also add to his or her advisory committee an advanced student and a member from outside the academic community. (Thus, a pre-med student may have a physician as a member of the committee, etc.) The presence of advisors from off campus is designed to provide more realistic advising and also to provide continuing dialogue about education and the world of work involving

lay leaders in the community, faculty members and students.

3. **Interdisciplinary Seminars** — The dimension of breadth in the educational program is addressed through both interdisciplinary general education seminars and a program of cross-cultural experiences. The eight general education seminars (referred to as core seminars) are truly interdisciplinary in nature and cannot be identified with any department or division of the curriculum. Three are taught during the Freshman year, three during the Sophomore year and two during the Senior year.

The Freshman core sequence consists of a series of three seminars which are intended to admit the student to the idiom of the twentieth century through the media of three radical perceptions which have shaped our century for good or ill. These are the perceptions which have emerged from the work of Sigmund Freud, Karl Marx, and Charles Darwin and each of the three Freshman Core seminars takes its departure respectively from one of these seminal figures. It should be noted that these are not seminars devoted wholly or even primarily to Freud, Marx or Darwin; the seminars are intended, rather, to select certain themes important to each man's work and to trace the influence of these themes on virtually every significant aspect of human activity.

The core seminars concentrate attention on the perennial issues of man's relationship to himself (with Freud's impetus), man's relationships to his institutions (with Marx's) and man's place in the natural order (with Darwin's). The three core seminars in the Sophomore sequence deal with these same issues while admitting the student to the idiom of the sixteenth century through the media of three radical perceptions which shaped subsequent centuries for good or for ill. These are the perceptions which have emerged out of the work of Martin Luther, Niccolo Machiavelli and Nicholus Copernicus, and each of the three Sophomore core seminars takes its departure from one of the three seminal figures.

The two Senior core seminars are problem oriented and the selection of content is determined primarily by student perceptions of the issues and problems of greatest interest and concern to them after three years of study.

4. **Cross Cultural Experiences**—Each student must spend a period of time off campus in a cultural setting genuinely different from that of his or her origin. The cross cultural experience may be in this country or overseas and a great variety of different arrangements have been made by students to satisfy this requirement.
5. **Depth Study**—The dimension of depth in the educational program is addressed through the depth study program.

Students can develop a depth study program which draws from one or more academic disciplines provided that there is a logical coherence to the program and it results in demonstrated competence, in depth, in the area which is defined by his or her contract.

6. **Academic Calendar**—The educational program is taught in an academic calendar divided into four seven-week sessions and one four-week Winter term during the academic year. Students take two courses each seven-week session and one course during the Winter term (i.e., 2-2-1-2-2). Thus, the calendar reduces the fragmentation of the learning experience in a typical semester system. It provides an opportunity for students to concentrate on only one or two courses at a time and to achieve some mastery before moving on to other courses.
7. **Evaluation Procedures**—The evaluation procedures are designed to provide each student with greater immediacy and specificity in the information received about his or her performance in a course. In addition to a letter grade (or pass-no credit in the core seminars), the student receives information about his or her performance in each course in terms of fourteen different dimensions of the learning process.

Evaluation

During the period of program planning the faculty agreed that the program should be evaluated, insofar as possible, in terms of the amount and the quality of the changes which occur in students during their participation in the program and ultimately their achievements in later life rather than being evaluated solely in terms of the characteristics of graduating Seniors and the level of their achievement. This, of course, requires special emphasis on the program of educational research and development.

For four years Ottawa University has invested at least two percent of its general and educational budget in a program of educational research and development run from the Office of the President by the Executive Assistant to the President, and more recently by a new full time Director of Educational Research and Development. This administrative arrangement enables the results of the R & D effort to have immediate impact on decisions as they are made day by day for the Director of R & D participates in the Administrative Council meetings and has easy access to the top decision makers and policy committees.

The basic thrust of the present research program is the measurement of change in students in light of the twenty statements of primary educational objectives for the program. A corollary emphasis is upon the problem of the unit cost in education and ways to utilize limited human resources more

effectively and efficiently so as to reduce unit cost while increasing the quality of the educational experience.

The initial attempts to evaluate the New Ottawa Program of Education have involved both subjective and objective devices. A program of Student Life Studies was initiated in 1968 in order to provide somewhat subjective information about the daily life experience of students and some indication and assessment of those experiences which have substantial impact—either positive or negative—on students. The general strategy developed at Ottawa has been described by Berte and Upshaw (1971). Basically, the program involves weekly meetings in small groups of a cross section of the Ottawa student body with a regular debriefing of group leaders.

Regular use is made of standardized tests to provide evaluative information about the Ottawa program. In addition, locally developed tests are being used to provide pre-test and post-test information about student progress in some of the core seminars.

In general, the new program of education at Ottawa University has worked far better during the first year and one-half of implementation than anyone dared to hope. Despite initial implementation problems the typical student reaction during the first year was "I'm working harder, learning more and enjoying it more than ever before." Needless to say, such a response was not universal! Evidence of positive student response is contained in statistics on student retention, for attrition was lower this year than in any year for which there are records. Likewise, a preliminary report on student grade point averages during the first year of the new program suggests marked improvement over previous years by a substantial number of students.

The transition from a fairly traditional curriculum to the new educational program of Ottawa University called for a herculean effort by the faculty. The new academic calendar forced a very substantial revision of every course in the curriculum. In addition, the core seminars have called for drastic changes in typical teacher behavior as almost every member of the faculty becomes involved in teaching outside the field of his or her graduate preparation. As expected, the work load of the faculty and administrative staff has been very heavy!

During the first year of implementation the major problem of implementation stemmed from the need to compress the work of a course equivalent to four semester hours into a seven-week session. No member of the faculty had taught in such a "compressed" situation and the adjustment was difficult during the first session. In many courses there was a conscious shift of emphasis in the direction of covering slightly less material in much greater depth. By the end of the third session most faculty members seemed quite comfortable with the new academic calendar although there are still problems in several disciplines growing from the shorter calendar sessions.

Indeed, a survey of faculty response to the new calendar at the beginning of the second year indicated that over 90% of the faculty would recommend the calendar to another college.

The work load has continued to be heavy in the second year as well. Perhaps, it would not be unfair to say that we are experiencing a bit of a "sophomore slump." It may be generally true that the second year of implementation of a new educational program is more difficult than the first. Some of the initial glamor has worn off and at Ottawa there is a growing awareness of the extraordinary demands upon a faculty member who takes seriously his obligation to students in a facilitative instructional setting with a heavy emphasis upon individualized instruction and academic advising. One of our problems, therefore, has to do with preventing what we call the "rubber band" effect as faculty members have a tendency to revert under stress to old and more comfortable ways of doing things. Our faculty professional development program has been most important to this end and our faculty has continued to perform quite well.

We continue to devote a very substantial amount of faculty time to the core seminars. These general education seminars require a substantial amount of time from both faculty and students. It is in this setting that we have the best evidence of a willingness of our faculty to attempt new and more effective teaching strategies in our new program. It is also in this setting that we see some of our limitations. We are engaged in a process of constant monitoring of the core curriculum. We are already in the process of revising some aspects of the core program in order to better achieve some of the original goals established for the core curriculum.

The second year program implementation is a time for more precise definition of some of our implementation problems. One problem is that we are so heavily involved with our implementation effort that there is not enough staff and faculty time available to devote to the next steps of program development in light of some of the opportunities mentioned in preceding sections of this report. At the same time, we do not want to proceed so rapidly with "innovation" and program development that we fail to consolidate the gains already made and ignore the human cost of change.

More specifically, it is possible to identify some of our implementation problems by sharing some of the questions that we face:

1. How can we best implement our advising concepts in terms of the demands on faculty time?
2. How can we provide more time for the supervision of independent study in light of the fact that the present size of our faculty is lower than that planned when we originally designed our new program?
3. How can we best institutionalize the process of planning and innovation in light of the faculty perception

that they are too "overworked" to devote substantial time to further planning?

4. How can we best prepare our faculty for interdisciplinary teaching and for teaching in new settings with new teaching styles?
5. How can we guard against the "rubber band" effect?
6. How can we balance our concerns for flexibility with our concern for "quality control"? Institutionally, this is a problem in terms of the development of contracts with each student for graduation as we seek to define and implement appropriate academic standards. It is also a problem in terms of the depth study programs since we face the necessity of defining the limitations on our capacities to be facilitators of student learning. There are some areas in which we simply do not have the expertise to offer a valid depth study despite the fact that students may have a strong interest in that area. This general issue is also of concern to the members of our faculty, personally, as we seek to find ways of becoming still more flexible in teaching styles and in developing criteria and strategies for evaluation of student performance, on the one hand, without loss of meaningful academic standards, on the other.
7. How can we best measure changes that take place in students either in terms of their own goals for learning or our institutional primary educational objectives? In short, what should we evaluate and how?
8. How can we best help students to make the transition from a fairly formal, structured learning situation to one in which they are required to take more initiative?
9. In light of our budget situation, how can we implement our cross-cultural program and our concern for flexible off-campus programming? It is clear that programs which are most desirable in a period of enrollment expansion become difficult to implement when enrollment is either declining or static at a point lower than the capacity of our physical plant.

We are wrestling with issues which are not only significant at this point in the history of Ottawa University but which are of great importance to higher education during the next decade, as well. The very nature of our problems provides evidence of growth toward a more effective center of learning. Higher education has avoided some of these issues for too long, and even partial success in resolving them will provide still more opportunity for educational leadership.

Faculty Professional Development

Ottawa University focuses its entire program on the education of undergraduate students. Administrative decisions on faculty salary, tenure and advancements in rank are based heavily on demonstrated competence in teaching undergrad-

uate students. Both student evaluations and evaluations by peers of the faculty are central to these decisions.

As an institution dedicated to effective student learning by undergraduates, Ottawa University has found it increasingly necessary to provide learning opportunities for faculty members which will enable them to function more effectively in interdisciplinary courses and in settings which require a variety of different teaching strategies and styles. Beginning in the summer of 1970, three week workshops have been available to faculty members each summer with the workshop time split about equally among three areas: 1) The subject matter of the interdisciplinary seminars; 2) The teaching and evaluation strategies effective in a variety of settings and issues related to criteria for evaluation of student performances; and 3) The problems of faculty members who must change their professional behaviors substantially during a period of program transition. Over 90% of the members of the faculty participated in the workshops during the summer of 1971 and an equal number will do so again this summer.

The experiences of the faculty workshops are supplemented by several different types of opportunities during the academic year. Week-end retreats four times a year provide opportunities for members of the faculty to discuss matters of professional concern in some depth. Topics have varied from one retreat to another, but each retreat deals with a topic of immediate importance to the success of the Ottawa program. In addition to the retreats, monthly dinner meetings and faculty forums provide opportunity for consideration of problems of program implementation.

These opportunities are also supplemented by weekly opportunities for small groups of faculty members to discuss concerns with a consultant from The Menninger Foundation. The sessions focus on the dynamics of the learning process, the pattern of relationships on campus as these contribute to the development of problems on campus or to their solution and the problems encountered by faculty members in a time of major program transition.

Fortunately, funds for the program of faculty professional development have been available through grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and from the Venture Fund program of The Ford Foundation.

The Alumni and church constituency, as well as the local community, have been most supportive of the new educational program of Ottawa University. A substantial effort has been made to keep these constituencies informed of program development. In these conversations it has been clear that a key to the enthusiastic continuing support of these groups is the belief that institutional purposes have not changed, but that the dramatic changes reflect new strategies for achieving the historic purpose of a Christian college of liberal arts in light of current knowledge about the learning process.

Some Thoughts About Experimentalism

Neal R. Berte

It is difficult to evaluate the total conference experiences. The formal and informal learning was both obvious and great in terms of the sharing of ideas and the esprit evident by the end of the conference.

One thing did seem clear, however. And that is the change in the institutions represented as a result of a number of innovative and experimental approaches was more fundamental than merely cosmetic. In some ways, the pluralism and diversity of innovation represented by these institutions demonstrates the sharing of a common critique of American undergraduate education in terms of the attempt to represent something different. By the same token, it is only fair to say that what the "something different" really is may be best seen in a process of evolution.

What are some of the concepts which were discussed at the conference which may be applicable to other institutions that are contemplating innovation or experimental programs? While indigenous conditions must influence specific approaches taken, there may be some common issues which have relevance for other programs.

First, the importance of a common understanding and agreement about the basic philosophy or purpose for the institution seems to be requisite. Possibly some of the newer institutions have a greater degree of vibrancy than some of the older institutions in this regard because of a sense of excitement about an institution which recently brought members of the faculty, administration and student body to that particular institution. When some commonly understood, if not fully accepted, statement of purpose is coupled with a commitment from the top administration of the institution, innovative programs seem to have a greater chance for success.

On a broader level than that of just one institution, it would appear that experimental colleges have a common commitment but they have not done a very effective job of sharing in terms of achieving goals. There was some feeling expressed that the few existing consortia-type efforts to organize institutions concerned with innovation have not done an effective job of assisting more than their members if they have even served their members well. Similarly, resources of a collaborative nature such as the Education Resource Information Center (ERIC) have not been viewed as fully effective since they have not been in the hands of practitioners and there is a feeling

that these previous efforts are artifacts of an earlier age. For example, strong support was expressed for **Change** magazine but there was a feeling that, in spite of all earlier efforts of a group nature at most "we ended up with **Change** magazine."

Additional task-oriented meetings for persons involved in innovative programs, increased sharing of such information from institutional committee reports instead of filing them away, establishment of laboratory colleges, support for the National Foundation for Postsecondary Education and the National Institute for Education, and serious consideration of additional umbrella organizations for innovative colleges were all specific suggestions made to further amplify and develop experimental approaches in American higher education.

Second, the taproot concept that learning needs to be linked to the individual student's interests and aspirations rather than enforcement by the college of a standardized learning experience for all persons attending seems to be a basic ingredient of these innovative efforts. Various program dimensions then become the vehicles for assuring institutional responsiveness that permits the kind of flexibility necessary to achieve this goal. And yet it appears that this ideal—the realization of individual potential—becomes clouded and polemical as liberal arts education is mixed with various approaches to general education and vocational preparation is added as an addition variable. The need for more effective integration of the goals of liberal arts versus vocational preparation in the context of the individualization of the curricular experience raises serious questions about where the liberalizing educational experience stops and training begins. If taken seriously, the goal of individualization throws the college degree "up for grabs" in terms of experience needed, time taken, and such issues as "how do I know when I'm through?" The learning contract as the vehicle for individualization seems to be one strategy for flexibility that permits and requires on a regular basis the question of each individual student regarding educational and vocational goals so that experiences of an in-class and out-of-class nature can be both planned and implemented.

Third, the assumption that significant learning occurs outside of class as well as within seems to be fairly well accepted. The type of social symbiosis between college and community varies with each institution but the importance of providing experiences within the curriculum to demonstrate a concern for relating the academic disciplines to the on-going human situation takes many forms—from cross-cultural experiences, to sub-cultural learning experiences, to work-internship-vocational experiences, to independent study opportunities out-of-class. The concept of the expanded campus including new learning environments, external degree programs and increased access for new clienteles such as minorities, housewives and members of the labor force has gained considerable acceptance.

Fourth, many representatives suggest a greater concern for a cross-section of students so that these institutions do not become characterized as attracting only one type of student. Admissions criteria for the experimental colleges vary from open admissions to a commitment to a planned cross-section of students to honors college approaches where only the so-called "intellectually elite" are attracted or admitted. In any case, the transition from a fairly structured set of previous educational experiences to less structured environments of individualized curricular programs generally produces trauma for students, faculty and administrators, not to mention members of the surrounding community. The special academic and social needs of culturally different groups further exacerbate this problem. Those institutions committed to a cross-section of students may be viewed as a part of a "proletarian revolution" in educational innovation. Many times, the chances for success at the local level seem to be enhanced by seeing to it that they are dealing with the needs of the various constituent groups which are representative of the total university.

Fifth, the need for honest attempts to involve persons in the outside community and in the immediate academic community with the process of change seems apparent. The enclave approach brings problems in terms of duplication of already scarce resources as well as fulfilling the negative image of some persons about "those crazy people over there." Just as it takes every individual awhile to adjust to new conditions, it is natural to expect persons in the community as well as on campus to be somewhat threatened by change as one thinks about the perceptions they have of what education should be based on their past experiences. One of the most successful types of involvement seems to be in an advisory board capacity for persons within and outside of the academic community so that input is possible while final authority to move ahead rests with those individuals having leadership responsibility in the experimental program. When time is taken to sit down and talk to the chairman of department X on campus, to involve faculty members outside of the experimental unit in admission interviews for new students, to participate in interdisciplinary seminars or other classes of the experimental unit, or just to share information with others about the progress and road-blocks of the program, a "wait and see" attitude may be developed at the least if not a stance of support. This appears to be a tenuous balance at best as one views the experimental unit in a larger university setting as a catalytic agent to introduce new ideas and experiment with new approaches versus the creation of waves which develop to tidal proportions so that the experimental unit is inundated beyond salvage.

Sixth, in an era of already limited financial resources, the issue of financing innovation and change becomes even more critical. Some seem to feel that the problem of providing assistance for the development of start-up phase is not as great

as the commitment for continuing support. Others stress the feeling that too often persons who advocate experimental programs do not ask what they will cost to start or maintain. The ideal seems to be to seek out seed grant monies, particularly if the program is in a large university setting, which may make the acceptance of a new program more palatable to more people. At the same time, the need to avoid duplication of resources but rather to re-deploy existing resources seems great. There is some feeling that perhaps the growing acceptance of program budgeting will enable individuals with innovative approaches to get a fair hearing for the benefits of the experimental unit on both educational and financial grounds. Others stress the fact that innovative programs bring greater possibilities for new resources from foundations and various governmental agencies than if change were attempted within existing departments or divisions.

Seventh, faculty development in innovative programs becomes even more critical in the area of changing values and feelings about what is effective teaching. The problem of re-tooling existing faculty to be able to teach differently with the new styles in an innovative setting leads one to conclude that the goal is to assist faculty with learning how to supervise innovation rather than to dispense it. Shifting the center from teaching *per se* to student-centered learning so that the faculty member is viewed as a co-learner seems important. Emphasis on both positive *and* negative learning so that there is recognition that productive learning may take place by disciplining one's self to do something that at first is not appealing, may not ever be pleasurable, or is not "fun" in the traditional sense may be worth noting. Changing the reward system so that there is greater emphasis on effective undergraduate teaching, developing some form of recognized agency within the faculty to deal with innovative teaching approaches, the use of faculty workshops, released time for faculty development activities, faculty peer group evaluation as well as evaluation by administrators and students, use of video tape and other audio visual equipment so that the faculty member may see himself in action—all are ideas to be considered.

At any rate, a certain type of faculty member would appear to be the best received, the most effective, and the most satisfied with innovative teaching situations. By and large this type of faculty member is one who has a flair for innovation, who is flexible and who is willing to recognize alternative approaches to teaching and learning. Caution is expressed that "psychic dropouts" may seek our programs with more flexible approaches as a way to meet their own personal needs. Just as the primary goal of the individualization of the educational experience for students requires the development of collaborative learning strategies, a differential pattern of staffing by function for faculty, administration and students may be desired.

Eighth, the implications of experimental units for the governance process are great. Approaches to shared governance seem to characterize institutions which have a high community awareness and enthusiasm. Governance structures based on educational function say something about representation on governing bodies of various campus constituencies including students, faculty, administrators, maintenance staff, secretaries, trustees, alumni and any other constituent groups. And yet final responsibility and authority to make decisions must be vested in an individual or group in such a way that movement within the organization is possible without reaching a majority decision on each issue.

Ninth, the issue of accreditation — credentialism seems to evoke varied responses when considered in the context of experimentalism. One approach is to create networks or consortia of experimental programs which would provide their own experimental standards. This would mean developing enough of a political base so that influence could be brought to bear to influence federal government funding programs to create new criteria for eligibility of the institutions to receive federal assistance. There is concern about the homogenization of institutions and the stifling of innovation, particularly with newer institutions, due to the current policy of required accreditation before federal assistance is possible. Some persons committed to experimentation stress the need to completely disregard concern for accreditation while others cite specific examples of support for experimental efforts by regional accrediting bodies and the importance of working with these organizations so that change may be brought about on a larger scale.

Finally, the need for a planned program of evaluation of the experimental experience from its inception seems imperative. In a time when the accountability issue looms larger on the horizon, it no longer suffices to say that "intuitively we think that what we are doing here is right." Concern for evaluation takes a number of different forms. Frequently, individual assessment generally leads to cost-efficiency studies. There is a feeling that supporters of management systems who are primarily concerned about quantitative criteria and cost-effectiveness are the enemies of experimental programs which more frequently have a qualitative dimension. Certainly assessment must be made in terms of dollars spent but also in other terms. There are some "rippling effects" of experimental programs, tensions created for change in the system, particularly in larger universities, which may never be adequately measured.

Qualitative research and development activities seem to mean a number of different kinds of things. While there are various approaches to measuring student achievement and performance in traditional cognitive terms, there may not be sufficient concern for the affective development of the student, i.e., how the individual is changing as a person in his total

development, his attitudes, his motivations, interests, etc. The importance of gathering these kinds of data cannot be stressed too much if there is to be any effective evaluation of the experimental college experience versus the more traditional approach for students. Various approaches to grading and the evaluation of learning in these experimental units dictate primary concern for evaluation activities of both a quantitative and qualitative nature as regards student development so that the student may be protected in terms of graduate school attendance and future vocational placement. There seems to be consensus about the need for intensive longitudinal follow-up studies of students in the experimental college. Getting students to complete and return evaluation instruments is sometimes difficult and seems to depend on the kind of orientation given to the student as to the reason the instrument is being administered.

Evaluation of faculty is another key concern. If differential staffing is utilized, determining faculty load in terms of the number of hours in class may be misleading. Evaluation might be better implemented based on the functions faculty perform rather than by the number of contract hours. An accepted and practiced form of faculty evaluation which involves students, faculty through self-evaluation, peer-group evaluation by faculty, and final administrative evaluation of faculty performance is recommended. The emphasis in promotion and tenure decisions may be better placed on the quality of undergraduate teaching rather than on recognized research competence and number of publications. While the concept of tenure itself is debatable in most experimental settings, some definite set of procedures for evaluating tenured faculty members would appear to be institutionally healthy. Similar evaluative opportunities for administrative staff people are important.

It appears that the most effective approach to research and development is represented by a cooperative endeavor involving students, faculty, administrators, and other constituent groups in terms of not only the evaluation process itself but the purpose and need for it. When evaluation is done as a part of a continuing process—an essential component of the program—rather than sporadically to justify some existing situation or future requests it appears to yield the best results. Some clear understanding of what is being measured and how as well as why is important.

Other significant issues could be cited, such as the increasing practice of awarding credit for non-traditional learning and life experiences utilizing various approaches from the College Level Examination Program to the evaluation of various proficiencies by "adjunct faculty" in the community already involved in the kind of work being evaluated, but perhaps this is an appropriate place to conclude these "thoughts about experimentalism."

It is doubtful that those in attendance at this conference will change the entire face of higher education, or perhaps that this is even desirable if it could be done. And yet there is more than a romantic commitment to the concept of change evident from both the conference activity and the institutional profiles. The need for planning, for agreement as to purpose and the importance of developing alternatives, is as obvious as the pluralism and diversity present in higher education. If humanistic education is to be the common goal, then perhaps the various innovative and experimental approaches expressing primary concern for the development of each student may promote the idea that schools must be humane places in which people can genuinely relate to each other while developing their own individual potential.

It is the hope that the various innovative and experimental efforts discussed in this publication may encourage other colleges and universities in similar situations to reflect deeply on new approaches and the benefits for their programs of these innovations, as well as to provide some evidence that change in undergraduate education is both possible and desirable.

Appendix A

Guidelines—Institutional Reports

Invitational Conference for Leaders of Experimental Colleges

1. Purpose

What are the primary educational objectives of the experimental program?

What is the basic philosophy underlying these objectives?

What have been, are currently, and will be the financial options available to carry out this innovation?

What are the projections for the future of this experiment in terms of enrollment?

Is there an optimally effective size and rate of growth for experimental efforts?

What are the future priorities and values for this experimental program?

Where does experimentation begin and continue and institutional "hardening of the arteries" begin with this experimental program?

How is the program structured so as to institutionalize change?

How does this program meet the needs of new clienteles (minority groups, housewives, members of the labor force, etc.)?

What contribution is being made to the reform of undergraduate education through this experimental program?

2. Identification of student learning experiences which represent desired outcomes of the experimental program

The question of what experiences for student development are provided as a part of the experimental program. Consideration of how such experiences are planned and included in the total program including questions of common core experiences in general education, advising, other required or elective activities, calendar, academic credit for out-of-class learning, sequencing of activities and course prerequisites, and any specialization of experiences by which the student may realize his educational objectives. What determines the students' readiness for graduation?

3. Innovative instructional approaches as a part of the experimental program

The question of the effectiveness of various instructional approaches in and out of the classroom setting including

interdisciplinary or other approaches to general education, aids to instruction including media of all types, attempts to work with faculty members regarding new teaching styles, involvement by students in curricular planning, out-of-class learning opportunities, the chance for creative and independent work at the undergraduate level.

4. Evaluation of student experience in the total program

In addition to routine questions dealing with grading procedures, concern for measurement of other attempts to get at both the cognitive and the affective development of students including use of various standardized objective testing instruments, small group approaches of a more subjective nature which provide an opportunity to deal with student life experiences, and others. Also included is the consideration of how methods of evaluation are communicated to the recipients.

Attempts to answer the question of how the college contributes to the ability of the student to think clearly (define problems, make distinctions, identify the nature and quality of arguments and evidence, assess the implications of data, etc.), the ability to communicate ideas orally and in writing, the ability to examine one's own ideas and develop values, the ability to participate in group and individual problem-solving and mastery of a coherent body of knowledge through understanding of the methodology of inquiry.

What are the guidelines for evaluating out-of-class learning opportunities? Non-traditional learning?

5. Development of faculty and evaluation of their contribution to the total program

The question of the criteria used in the evaluation of faculty for contract renewal, promotion, tenure decisions, and course load including specific descriptions of how such decisions are made. Also included is consideration of various approaches used to assist faculty with new teaching and learning styles and efforts to provide in-service faculty development opportunities.

6. Concern for external relations

Consideration of how to translate programs which deviate from the traditional in regard to external standards such as those of state certification agencies, graduate schools, programs for business and industry, etc.

What are the constraints of the alumni, state or federal government, foundations or the legislature?

How do local community expectations, preferences, priorities and prejudices enter the picture?

What, if any, is the "career risk" of students in the experimental program? What are the "career risks" for the innovators?

What mechanisms are needed for the dissemination of "successful" innovations?

Appendix B

Evaluation of Conference

**James Stone
Graduate Student, The University of Alabama**

Due to the diversity of innovation and experimentation represented by conference participants, the evaluation of the proceedings is necessarily reflective of majority opinion rather than consensus. The conference was generally viewed as pleasant, informative, and productive. Discussion was described as being candid, reflecting insight, and possessing depth.

Dr. James P. Dixon, President of Antioch College: "It was the first time in a number of years that I have been a member of such a group, where the data and the quality of the ability to criticize it was so adequate."

Dr. Arthur Chickering, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Empire State College of the State of New York, and conference consultant: "The main value of the conference for me was the fact that the problems and dynamics of the educational environment were dealt with in much greater depth and with greater insight and understanding than I have ever before found."

Dr. John Maguire, President, College at Old Westbury, State University of New York: "The exploration of common concerns and the open sharing of experience and insight were exceedingly valuable."

Among those aspects and outcomes of the conference most often identified as of most value were:

- (1) the pooling of common experiences and concerns
- (2) the creation of new personal associations and the opening of communication channels among participants
- (3) the elaboration of developments, practices, and techniques being pursued by the experimenting institutions
- (4) the discussion of the process of change and future conditions in higher education.

Those items most frequently referred to as undesirable were:

- (1) the intensity of the schedule

- (2) the time spent in the verbal presentations of individual programs
- (3) the lack of clarification at times regarding the role of the observers attending the conference.

If there was consensus it is to be found in regard to future communication among the participants. Repeatedly, they called attention to the need for a means of maintaining contact whereby future needs and experiences can be shared. Future meetings with a task-oriented agenda were recommended.

Appendix C

Roster of Participants

Dr. William M. Adams
COSIP - UES
National Science Foundation
Washington, D. C. 20550

Dr. Peter H. Armacost
President
Ottawa University
Ottawa, Kansas 66067

Dr. Samuel Baskin, President
Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities
Antioch College
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

Dr. Neal R. Berte
Dean, New College
The University of Alabama
University, Alabama 35486

Dr. Robert Birney, Vice President
Hampshire College
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

Dr. Arthur Chickering, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Empire State College of the State of New York
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866

Dr. James P. Dixon, President
Antioch College
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

Dr. Russell Edgerton, Special Assistant to the Secretary
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20201

Dr. Kenneth Freeman, Dean, Fairhaven College
Western Washington State University
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Dr. Harold Hodgkinson, Project Director
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
Berkeley, California 94707

**Dr. John Jacobsen, Dean
Florida Presbyterian College
St. Petersburg, Florida 33733**

**Dr. Douglas Lamont, ACE Academic Administrative Intern
The University of Alabama
University, Alabama 35486**

**Dr. Ernest A. Lynton, Dean, Livingston College
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903**

**Dr. John Maguire, President
State University College of Old Westbury
Long Island, New York 11568**

**Dr. Robert Maier, Vice Chancellor
University of Wisconsin at Green Bay
Green Bay, Wisconsin 53706**

**Dr. David Mathews, President
The University of Alabama
University, Alabama 35486**

**Dr. Peter Meyer
Southern Regional Education Board
130 6th Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313**

**Mr. Scott Morgan
Centennial Education Program
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508**

**Dr. Edward Passerini, Assistant Professor, New College
The University of Alabama
University, Alabama 35486**

**Dr. Lyle Phillips
Acting Executive Assistant to the Deputy, Education
National Science Foundation
Washington, D. C. 20550**

**Mrs. Senta A. Raizen, National Institute of Education
425 13th Street, N. W., Room 1148
Washington, D. C. 20004**

**Dr. Lloyd J. Ring, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor
University of California, Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz, California 95060**

**Mr. Jim Stone, Graduate Student
The University of Alabama
University, Alabama 35486**

Student Participants:

Mr. Alan Chickering
RFD No. 2
Plainville, Vermont 05667

Mr. Steve Berryman
Mr. John Bivens
Miss Laurie Prentice
Mr. John Saxon
Miss Marty Shamblin
c/o New College
The University of Alabama
University, Alabama 35486